

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. XXVIII.

BALTIMORE, FEBRUARY, 1913.

No. 2.

THE CASE OF SOMAIZE

Antoine Baudeau or Beaudeau, sieur de Somaize, began the second period of his existence in 1856. He had been born presumably in the year 1630.¹ With the publication of Ch.-L. Livet's edition of his *Dictionnaire des Précieuses* Somaize dead became privileged to enjoy a vogue totally unknown to Somaize living. Slighted during his lifetime, ignored for the space of more than two hundred years, he is at last occupying an exalted posthumous rank. Five years of Livet's life were devoted to the preparation of his works on Somaize.² Paul Lacroix reprinted *Les Véritables Précieuses*, accompanying it with an introduction.³ The late M. Larroumet gave Somaize the place of honor in his *Études de littérature et d'art*.⁴ M. Emile Magne has relied chiefly on Somaize for the facts presented in his *Madame de la Suze et la société précieuse*.⁵ Finally, Herr Fritz Schwarz has made Somaize the subject of a doctor's thesis.⁶ It is hardly an exaggeration to say that few studies on seventeenth-century literature and society in France have, since the appearance of Livet's book, failed to cite Somaize as an authority.

A brief summary of the opinions concerning Somaize's contributions to literary and social knowledge will serve to indicate the high esteem in which he is held. M. Bourciez considers his name "inséparable de cette période de notre littérature, et c'est dans son *Grand Dictionnaire* qu'il faut chercher les renseignements les plus circonstanciés sur l'étrange épidémie qui sévissait alors."⁷ In the words of Larroumet, Somaize has left a name, and his works will have

to be consulted as long as his models remain of interest.⁸ M. Delaporte regards Somaize as a faithful collector of *précieux* mannerisms.⁹ Professor Crane quotes Somaize at length concerning the use of emphatic adverbs in the age of Boileau.¹⁰ M. Magne has as much confidence in Somaize as in Tallemant des Réaux. Livet believes it quite within the realm of possibility that Molière had Somaize's dictionary in front of him when he composed the *Précieuses ridicules*.¹¹

Testimony of this character—of which the foregoing constitutes merely a suggestion—would seem to be sufficient to assure Somaize of a permanent and honorable position among the sources utilized by students of the seventeenth century. There are, however, such peculiar deficiencies in Somaize's personal record, and such doubtful phases in his work, that evidence obtained from him and discussion centering on him may well be subjected to scrutiny.

One of the first essentials required of any historical witness is that he establish his own identity with the period in which his testimony is accepted. He must do this through direct evidence of some sort. If he has not done it for himself, those who make use of him must do it for him. In so far as Somaize is concerned, it would be legitimate to doubt that he ever lived. Larroumet, Livet, and the rest freely admit that we have no information either as to Somaize's birth or as to his death; either as to his birthplace or as to his family. "Sorti de l'obscurité en 1657, il y est rentré en 1661."¹² If it were not for the trustworthiness of the scholars who have been his sponsors, we might suspect Somaize of being an eigh-

¹ Larousse, *Grand Dict. universel*, xiv, 1875.

² Livet, *Dict. des Préc.*, préface, p. xxxvi.

³ Genève, J. Gay et fils, 1868.

⁴ Paris, Hachette, 1893, pp. 1-54.

⁵ Paris, Mercure de France, 1908.

⁶ Fritz Schwarz, *Somaize und seine Précieuses rid.*, Königsberg, 1903.

⁷ In Petit de Julleville, *Litt. fr.*, iv, p. 129.

⁸ Larroumet, *Études de litt.*, p. 53.

⁹ P. V. Delaporte, *Du merveilleux dans la litt. fr. sous le règne de Louis XIV*, Paris, 1891, pp. 200 and 224-225.

¹⁰ T. F. Crane, *Les Héros de roman*, 1902, p. 204.

¹¹ *Précieux et Précieuses*, Paris, 1895, Intr., pp. xxx-xxxi.

¹² Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 4.

teenth or nineteenth century hoax, the more convincing in that he cannot be traced to any modern writer through a revealing cleverness of expression or through peculiarities of style. His very mediocrity has saved him from critical inspection. But, granted that he played some rôle in the seventeenth century, how are we to account for the absolute dearth of mention of him by his contemporaries? Nobody appears to have heard of him. The preface to his *Dictionnaire*, ostensibly written by a friend, though in all probability due to the author's own pen, states magniloquently that "jamais homme n'a tant fait de bruit que luy dans un âge si peu avancé. Il a eu l'honneur de faire assembler deux ou trois fois l'Académie française; il a fait parler de luy par toute la France; il s'est fait craindre, il s'est fait aimer."¹³

Yet this prodigy has never been made the subject of a paragraph, a sentence, a line even in the discursive pages of the *Ménagiana*, the *Segraisiana*, the *Huetiana*, the *Furetièriana*, or in the wide-ranging notes of Bayle. That the *Académie* should have foregathered on account of any one man and left no record of what must have been momentous meetings seems hard to believe. No accounts of such reunions, however, exist.¹⁴ The reader has almost no escape from the conviction that the friend's assertion is false. Two recent writers have attempted to provide Somaize with distinguished acquaintances in his own day: but they have both made almost inexcusable blunders, though nobody has as yet, I believe, called attention to them. Herr Schwarz declares that Livet was mistaken in affirming that no trace of Somaize can be found among his contemporaries. "Boileau, den er in seiner *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron* lächerlich machte, widmet ihm den schmeichelfhaften Vers:

Aux Somaizes futurs préparer des tortures
(Sat. IX)."¹⁵

The name used by Boileau, and slightly altered by Herr Schwarz, happens to be that of

Claude de Saumaise, the erudite commentator who died in 1653, as the note to the Fournier edition of Boileau clearly proves.¹⁶ M. Magne, who is certain that Somaize is a *bourguignon*, though Larroumet makes him out to be a *gascon*, and Herr Schwarz judges him a *normand*, deposes that Boisrobert definitely mentions our Somaize. "Boisrobert. *Les Epistres*, 1647, p. 154, A. M. Gineste, dit en effet, qu'il lui communique, étant en Bourgogne, les épîtres qu'il reçoit de son ami Gineste. Il le nomme Somaize, mais l'orthographe du nom n'a, à ce moment, aucune importance et nous avons la certitude qu'il ne s'agit pas, en cet endroit, de Claude de Saumaise qui habitait Leyde."¹⁷ If, as Somaize's friend stated, he was a young man in 1660, and if we assume thirty years of age to be a fair guess, thus placing the date of Somaize's birth in 1630, it is clear that he must have been seventeen years old on the occasion referred to by M. Magne. It is scarcely likely that Boisrobert submitted to a school-boy the *épîtres* sent him by Gineste. The critic, Claude de Saumaise, is undoubtedly the person in question. Moreover, Boisrobert could not have obtained from this juvenile Somaize the latest news concerning the *Académie*, the *Hôtel de Bourgogne*, and the *Marais*.¹⁸

The latest efforts, then, to furnish witnesses of the existence of Somaize have been fruitless. We are no wiser than before. In an era of portrait-writing, when insignificant characters were honored by one or more notices in the collections of portraits, the novels, the satires, the farces, Somaize was neglected. The only picture of him handed down to us is that written by Somaize himself, under the name of Suzarion.¹⁹ It is needless to remark that he does not err on the side of injustice in evaluating his qualities either as a man or as an author. He may readily have ascribed to himself many virtues that he did not possess, just

¹³ *Œuvres complètes de M. Boileau*, par Edouard Fournier, Paris, 1873, p. 52.

¹⁴ Magne, *Le plaisant abbé de Boisrobert*, Paris, 1909, p. 365.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

¹⁶ *Dict. des Préc.*, ed. Livet, p. 226.

¹⁷ *Dict. des Préc.*, ed. Livet, préf., p. 15.

¹⁸ Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 27.

¹⁹ Schwarz, *Somaize*, etc., p. 2.

as he borrowed a title of nobility which, Larroumet conjectures, did not belong to him.²⁰

Though nobody appears to have known him personally, we have one document tending to show that notice was taken of his works by the great writers. This is the *Songe du Rêveur*, an answer to Somaize's *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron*. It is supposed to have been constructed by Molière and other poets in collaboration, whom the *Pompe* had attacked. Written in prose and verse, it is even more platitudinous and execrable than Somaize's own works. That neither Molière nor the other worthies could have stooped to put hand to this pamphlet is the conclusion of MM. Despois and Mesnard.²¹ Whoever the author was, he was aware that Somaize's satire had been rewarded with one of those beatings not uncommon in the refined society of the age of Louis XIV. Curiously enough, Somaize himself in his *Remarques sur la Théodore* of Boisrobert (1657) acknowledges, not without pride, that Boisrobert had previously threatened him with corporal chastisement. It is barely possible that Somaize wrote the attack on himself. The *Songe* appeared anonymously—as did most of the books attributed to Somaize—and it is more in his style than in that of anybody else of whom we have knowledge. We may find it difficult to understand the attitude of a man who could attack himself in public print; but if we remember that cases have occurred in which a literary critic and dramatist has praised his own plays, it may not strike us as incongruous that a most peculiar and mysterious scribe like Somaize may have degraded himself for purposes of advertisement. Anybody who reads his works in a spirit free from prejudice realizes that Somaize was seeking notoriety at any cost. To be fulminated against by the popular playwrights and poets would have been glory to many a man.

Not content with providing himself in rather an unconventional fashion with a character and, as is thought, with a title, Somaize has taken pains to present himself under powerful patron-

age. The four personages to whom he has dedicated various of his undertakings are Marie Mancini—the connétable Colonna and niece of Mazarin,—Henri Louis Habert, the Academician, the Marquise de Monloy or Monlouet, and the Duc de Guise, who figures in Paul de Musset's *Extravagants et Originaux du XVII^e siècle*. This array of dignitaries would ordinarily suffice to lend weight to the words of any aspirant in arts. Yet, as in most things connected with Somaize, there is something suspicious in the persons he has chosen as his literary god-parents. The Duc de Guise, brilliant, foolhardy, baffled in most of his plans, is thus addressed by Somaize: "Après avoir dit tant de belles et d'illustres veritez, ne puis-je pas, Monseigneur, m'écrier avec justice que vous estes le plus genereux, le plus galand, le plus civil, le plus vaillant, le plus adroit, le mieux fait, et pour renfermer dans un mot toutes ces nobles qualitez, le plus accomply de tous les princes de la terre?"²² The death of the Duc occurred four years after the publication of the *Dictionnaire*. Of the Marquise de Monloy, whose virtue appears to have been her least failing, he exclaims: "Dans ce lieu où vostre naissance vous avait appelée, dans ce lieu, dis-je, où la médisance n'épargne personne, vostre vertu lui a si bien fermé la bouche que les plus médisans ne l'ont jamais ouverte que pour publier que vous estiez la plus sage et la plus vertueuse personne de la cour."²³ Habert was noted as a Maecenas. As for Marie Mancini, her tempestuous character and her sentiments toward Louis XIV are well-known. Married by proxy to Colonna, she arrived in Rome in June, 1661. Somaize claims to have followed in her retinue as her secretary, and the title-page of the second part of the *Dictionnaire* bears the legend, "Par le Sieur De Somaize secretaire de Madame la Conestable Colonna." According to Lacroix, the cessation of Somaize's labors was due to his absence from France, to which he never returned.²⁴ One might suppose that here, at last, direct

²⁰ Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 5.

²¹ *Œuvres de Molière*, ed. Despois et Mesnard, Paris, tome ix, 1886, pp. 569-571.

²² *Dict. des Préc.*, ed. Livet, pp. 5-6.

²³ *Dict. des Préc.*, II, p. 52: preface to the *Proces des Pretieuses*.

²⁴ *Les Vêrit. Prêt.*, ed. Lacroix, notice, p. xii.

evidence about Somaize would be met, especially since Marie Mancini published, or caused to be published, in 1678 the *Apologie, ou les Véritables Mémoires de Madame M. Mancini*. Though she mentions several servants and retainers, she has not once spoken of Somaize.²⁵ Neither Amédée Renée nor Lucien Perey, who have investigated carefully Marie Mancini's life, has a word to say about Somaize.²⁶ Until genuine proof is offered, the presumption, it seems to me, is against Somaize's having held the position of which he boasts. Why, then, has he selected her for his benefactress? That problem must remain in as much doubt as his reasons for sending his other writings out under the wing of a discredited soldier, a discredited coquette, and an Academician accessible to everybody. It is probable that none of them paid much attention to him, and that they were convenient figure-heads whom almost any writer could utilize in time of need. The mere fact that dedications were addressed to the nobility does not imply that the nobility sanctioned them or acquiesced in the opinions of the authors. It does not mean, as some critics have imagined, that they lent their moral support to Somaize, or that they knew him, or that they ever heard of his works or of his dedications.

The mystery that envelops Somaize is in no way dissipated by an examination of his title-pages or of the list of works ascribed to him. Somaize's friend declared that our author had published nine or ten books. Larroumet credits him with only seven.²⁷ Herr Schwarz grants that he wrote eight, among which is an elegy in 112 Alexandrines dedicated to Marie Mancini.²⁸ In reality, the number of Somaize's writings, as attributed to him in the different accounts which I have thus far been able to examine, amounts to twelve. On seven of them the principal authorities are agreed. They are:

1. *Le Grand Dictionnaire des Précieuses*, I;

2. *Le Grand Dictionnaire des Précieuses*, II;
3. *Les Précieuses ridicules*, in verse;
4. *Le Procez des Précieuses*;
5. *Les Véritables Précieuses*;
6. *Les Remarques sur la Théodore*;
7. *La Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron*.

A *Pompe funèbre d'une précieuse*, advertised by Somaize and thought by some to have appeared, is regarded by Livet as never having seen the light.²⁹ Lacroix mentions a *Dialogue de deux Précieuses sur les affaires de leur communauté*, contained in the second edition of the *Véritables Précieuses*,³⁰ and *La Cocue imaginaire*, in verse.³¹ The writer of the biography of Somaize in Larousse's *Dictionnaire* adds *le Secret d'être toujours belle*.³² If the present tendency to enlarge the scope of Somaize's activities is persisted in, it may soon be necessary to open a special section for his *apocrypha*, as has been done in the case of a few great writers, notably Shakespeare.

Eight of these works were written in one year, 1660, namely, *Les Précieuses ridicules*, *La Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron*, the *Dialogue*, *Les Véritables Précieuses*, *Le Grand Dictionnaire*, I, *La Cocue imaginaire*, *La Pompe funèbre d'une Précieuse*, *Le Procez des Précieuses*. They are all short pamphlets and might easily have been produced in that space by one man. The majority of the total collection lacks the name of Somaize. With the exception of the *Cocue*, printed under the name of François Donneau, this larger portion came forth anonymously. One person, however, is nearly omnipresent—Jean Ribou, the book dealer.³³ In some instances, the *privilege* granted Somaize is immediately transferred to Jean Ribou; thus, the *Grand Dictionnaire*, I; in others, the imprint of Jean Ribou is the only mark of identification, as in the *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron* and the *Véritables Précieuses*: in one—the *Remarques sur la Théodore*—, the authorship of Somaize is stated together with the addendum: "imprimées à ses dépens."

²⁵ Schwarz, *Somaize*, etc., p. 5.

²⁶ Cf. Amédée Renée, *Les Nièces de Mazarin*, Paris, 1858; Lucien Perey, *Marie Mancini Colonna*, Paris, 1896.

²⁷ Larroumet, *Études*, etc., pp. 25-26.

²⁸ Schwarz, *Somaize*, etc., p. 7.

²⁹ *Dict. des Préc.*, II, ed. Livet, p. 55.

³⁰ *Vérit. Prét.*, ed. Lacroix, notice, p. vii.

³¹ *Ibid.*, notice, p. x.

³² *Op. cit.*, tome xiv.

³³ Cf. Schwarz, *Somaize*, etc., p. 6.

Why so much mystification where everything should have been open and above-board? The following hypotheses may be entertained: Somaize feared the wrath of Molière, Boisrobert, the *précieuses*, and the poets manhandled by him in the *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron*; he was a person of importance and not an individual named Somaize, and wished to preserve an *incognito*; he was an author pillaged by Molière and timid about charging the favorite comedian with bare-faced plagiarism, as Charles Sorel might have done; he was a publisher who was desirous of making money out of the popular theme of *préciosité* rendered famous overnight by Molière. That he had no very great fear of Molière and the rest is evidenced by the fact that he presented himself in his own person in dealing with Boisrobert and later claimed the responsibility for the *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron*. In addition, he seems to have enjoyed the protection of the *chancelier*, if his words can be accepted at their face value,³⁴ and succeeded in having inserted in the authorization of his *Procez des Précieuses* the most preposterous prohibition ever made use of by any author, directing that nobody should take it upon himself "ni même de se servir des mots contenus en icelui."³⁵ Any of the other suppositions may be argued with a show of reason. That Somaize was desperately hostile to Molière seems clear through his burlesques in verse of some of the dramatist's plays; and Larroumet specifically designates his attacks as the first made against Molière.³⁶ Several incidents demonstrate that he knew Molière well, or at least was in touch with what the latter was doing. The most conspicuous is in the *Véritables Précieuses*, where the as yet unpublished *Don Garcie de Navarre* is mentioned.³⁷ Whatever his feeling toward Molière was, he did not disdain to steal unconscionably from him, as Büchmann, with his four and a quarter pages of the deadly parallel, has proved.³⁸ Of course, if the exact dates of publication of the genuine

Précieuses ridicules and the *Grand Dictionnaire des Précieuses* were not available, the question as to who copied whom might be impossible of solution. We know, however, that Molière's play appeared Jan. 29, 1660, and Somaize's *Dictionnaire*, April 12 of that year.³⁹ How Livet was persuaded to believe that Molière borrowed from his enemy is hard to understand. If he had mentioned, besides the Abbé de Pure's *Prétieuse*, Sorel's voluminous compositions on the *précieuses* and the Abbé d'Aubignac's disquisitions as Molière's sources, he would undoubtedly have been much nearer the truth.

The identity of Somaize, accordingly, appears to be obscure. It is not the intention of the present writer to try to clear up this particular puzzle. It is his desire, indeed, to open that subject for discussion, but more especially, to raise the question concerning Somaize's value as a witness in behalf of *préciosité*. Whoever he was—whether a hoax as to name or a real living person—, his testimony might still be valid, provided it were shown to be original. If he did nothing more than pilfer existing material, then we must discard him in whole or in part as an independent contributor to our knowledge of the seventeenth century. If he was of the caliber of Charles Sorel—who probably knew more than Molière about *préciosité*—, we should be justified in admitting his statements where they do not conflict with Molière's and where they would not be likely to be colored by feelings of personal spite. For, as may not be generally known, Molière's unacknowledged debt to Charles Sorel was almost incredibly large,⁴⁰ and it would be wrong to blame Sorel severely for whatever reprisals he might indulge in.

In general, Somaize is esteemed a friend of the *précieuses*. Larroumet is convinced that he seriously meant to defend them, and quotes: "Je n'ai pas prétendu par ce titre parler de ces personnes illustres qui sont trop audessus de la satire pour faire soupçonner que l'on ait dessein de les y insérer."⁴¹ Nevertheless, few men and women who ever used metaphorical

³⁴ Cf. Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 13.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

³⁶ Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 8.

³⁷ Cf. Lacroix, *Vérit. Prét.*, notice, p. ix.

³⁸ Büchmann, *Somaize*, in *ASNS.*, 1861, pp. 51 ff.

³⁹ Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 29.

⁴⁰ Cf. Emile Roy, *Charles Sorel*, Paris, 1891.

⁴¹ Cf. Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 37.

and affected language about the year 1660 and, in some instances, before, have been omitted from his catalog of *précieux* and *précieuses*. Malherbe occupies a place in it (p. 64): Queen Christine of Sweden is not forgotten (p. 49): Corneille is treated at some length (pp. 85-92).⁴² Obviously, Somaize has in mind an extremely elastic definition of *préciosité* which should put us on our guard against over-confidence in his decisions. His books have not in any real sense added to the population of the kingdom of *préciosité*. The inhabitants discussed by him we have already learned about, for the most part, in Mlle de Scudéry's novels, in Voiture's letters, in Molière's comedies. He has supplied us with few additional details. The Greek names borne by his personages—Quirinus by Quinault, Gadarie by Mlle de Gournay—are of his own coinage, and do not perpetuate the pseudonyms actually used in designating them. Outside of this, the suspicion that the author furnished only a meager handful of facts from his own personal store grows strong, especially when we read in the *privilege du roy* the extract given below, to which none of the students of Somaize has called attention:

Ce Dictionnaire historique des pretieuses est un *extrait fidelle* de toutes les galanteries qui regardent cette matière dans les *meilleurs romans du temps*, et mérite d'estre imprimé, afin qu'on connoisse les habitants et la langue du pais des alcoves et des ruelles.—Ballesdens.⁴³

In the face of this declaration, we should scarcely feel willing to credit Somaize with much originality or to rank his dictionary among important contemporary witnesses of the essence and the propagation of the mannerism termed *préciosité*.

A last doubt may be ventured concerning Somaize's sincerity in retailing his information to the public. To believe that he has done it for commendable motives or in a frame of mind which should secure for his words serious consideration by historians is, it seems to me, completely to ignore the tenor of his own affirma-

tions. The very title of his *Grand Dictionnaire* is a burlesque and reminds one forcibly of Rabelais:

"Le Grand Dictionnaire des Pretieuses, Historique, Poetique, Geographique, Cosmographique, Cronologique et Armoirique Où l'on verra leur antiquité, costumes, devises, eloges, etudes, guerres, heresies, jeux, loix, langage, mœurs, mariages, morale, noblesse; avec leur politique, prédictions, questions, richesses, reduits et victoires; comme aussi les noms de ceux et de celles qui ont jusques icy inventé des mots pretieux."

Somaize evidently thought himself a good deal of a wag. In the preface to the *Précieuses ridicules* he confesses to lengthening out his introduction simply because he has some unwritten paper still left.⁴⁴ In the "autre apostille" to his *Dictionnaire* he observes that he is besieged by persons bringing him *mémoires* for use in his book, and that if he had attempted to content them all the reader would not have received his work for six months longer.⁴⁵ The preface by a friend, adopting a suitably grave tone, dilates on the importance to posterity of the *Dictionnaire*, "histoire veritable et dont les siècles futurs doivent s'entretenir,"⁴⁶ and curiously enough, in a way which cannot have been foreseen by him, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have busied themselves with it, though the seventeenth and eighteenth ignored it. In the note addressed by the bookseller to the reader,—manifestly the concoction of Somaize, also,—those eager to purchase the book are begged to have patience and to remember that "il faut non seulement du temps pour le faire, mais encore pour imprimer un ouvrage si grand et si mystereux."⁴⁷ In another passage, the author promises that in the second part, shortly forthcoming, will be seen "toutes les predictions astrologiques qui concernent leurs estats et empires (which is reminiscent of Cyrano de Bergerac); l'on y connoistra aussi ce que c'est que les Pretieuses et leurs mœurs. Il y aura, de plus, un sommaire de leur origine, progrès, guerres, conquestes et victoires."⁴⁸

⁴² *Dict. des Préc.*, II, pp. 46-47.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 276.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, *préf.* by un ami, p. 10.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. lxi.

⁴⁶ *Dict. des Préc.*, p. xl.

⁴⁷ The pages refer to the *Grand Dict.*, ii.

⁴⁸ *Dict. des Préc.*, ed. Livet, p. 18. The italics are mine.

The above is probably sufficient to convince the reader that a better knowledge of Somaize would be desirable and that a cautious, discriminating attitude, unbiased by what has thus far been written about Somaize's revelations on seventeenth century literature and society, would be advisable in the perusal of his works.

J. WARSHAW.

University of Missouri.

SOME NOTES ON HAMLET

I

Rowe is our authority for the statement that Shakespeare acted "the ghost in his own Hamlet." Yet Shakespeare, as we know from several sources, was an actor of ability; consequently it seems hardly likely that his share in the performance of the play would consist of only a minor part requiring the utterance of less than a hundred lines. Since it was common for players to assume more than one rôle, we may conclude that Shakespeare acted some other character in addition to the Ghost. An examination of the text shows that this character would be limited to (1) Rosencrantz, Guildenstern, or Osric; (2) Claudius, Laertes or Fortinbras; (3) the First Player.

It is highly unlikely that he assumed the comic part of Rosencrantz, Guildenstern, or Osric. This would not be in keeping with the statement by John Davies (*The Scourge of Folly*, 1610), that he played "some kingly parts," with the statement of his brother that he performed the dignified part of Adam in *As You Like It*, or with his assumption of the part of the Ghost in *Hamlet*.

Again, it seems unlikely that he took the part of Claudius, for the rôle of Claudius would be in itself quite enough for one actor—say Heminge, or Condell; and for him to assume this in addition to the rôle of the Ghost would put too heavy a burden of acting upon his shoulders. Furthermore, in Act I, scene 2,

Claudius enters thirty-three lines after the exit of the Ghost. This would hardly allow time for the necessary changes in costume.

And since, in the scene just referred to, Laertes enters with Claudius, he seems also to be excluded from consideration; for surely it would be impossible for Shakespeare during the quick utterance of thirty-three lines to change himself from a ghost "so majestic" into a young gallant ready for "the primrose path of dalliance"—if, indeed, Shakespeare's qualities as an actor fitted him for such a rôle.

The character of Fortinbras, who speaks only twenty-six lines, is histrionically too insignificant for a "sharer." Any "hireling" properly costumed might perform his part satisfactorily.

This process of elimination leaves for our consideration the First Player. No objection, I believe, can be raised to him. The rôle is sufficiently important to justify Shakespeare in assuming it; at no time does it interfere with the rôle of the Ghost; and its lines throughout are in keeping with what we know of Shakespeare's quality as an actor. The same voice that uttered the solemn conjurations of the Ghost could have spoken well the story "of Priam's slaughter," and equally well, too, the lines of the Player King in "The Murder of Gonzago." Furthermore, if Shakespeare acted the part of the Ghost, and then of the Player King, this fact could be used to heighten greatly the effect of the "Mouse Trap"; for the Player King could be made to resemble closely in features the elder Hamlet.

II

Laertes. . . . Hold off the earth awhile
Till I have caught her once more in mine arms:
[*Leaps into the grave.*
Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead. . .
Hamlet [*Advancing*]. . . This is I,
Hamlet the Dane. [*Leaps into the grave.*¹

The leaping of Laertes and of Hamlet into the grave of Ophelia has always seemed to me both startling and unpleasing. Surely the dead body of the unfortunate Ophelia might be

¹ V, i, 272-81.

spared such an outrage. Moreover, the action seems rather inappropriate on the part of Laertes, who throughout invariably does what he thinks the world expects of him. No editor of the play, so far as I am aware, has attempted, by any explanation, to make this action less startling or less painful to the reader.

Recently, while examining Richard Brathwaite's play, *Mercurius Britannicus* (1640), I came upon the following passage:

"What canst thou finde in this spacious Theater of the world, which is worthy thy smallest teare? where servants are made Lords, Lords servants: the Masters head is cut off, the servant riseth up and climbs into his place: wives bewaile the funerall of their husbands, counterfeit teares, and offer to leape into their graves; and yet before one worme hath entred into the winding sheete, or before the flowres are withered wherewith the coarse was garnished, they entertaine new affections, and kindle new nuptiall tapers."

Does this passage suggest that offering to leap into the grave was in the seventeenth century sometimes used as an exaggerated expression of sorrow? There is absolutely nothing to indicate that Brathwaite was echoing *Hamlet*. If we can believe that Laertes's conduct was suggested by the occurrence even rarely of this sensational mode of expressing sorrow, we can better understand the scene in *Hamlet*; for Laertes's conduct would then appear more natural, and, like his bearding the King with a drawn sword, thoroughly in keeping with his newly assumed rôle of a melodramatic hero. Of course more references to leaping into the grave (as a real or an imaginary way of expressing sorrow)² are needed to render this suggestion plausible.

III

Hamlet's attempt to make his friends swear, in which he shifts to four several places on the stage³ ("Hic et ubique? then we'll shift our ground. . . . Once more remove, good

² It is not necessary to conceive of the "leaping into the grave" as an actual custom; it may have figured merely in the imagination of the literary artist.

³ I, v, 148-82.

friends") is apt to be taken as grotesque. Yet perhaps there was something conventional in this, as Professor Bradley suggests (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 412). I am reminded of the attempt of Balaam to curse the Children of Israel (*Numbers* xxiii-xxiv). Each time Balaam found himself unable to utter his curse, and each time Balak suggested a removal of ground ("And Balak said unto him, Come; I pray thee, with me unto another place. . . . And Balak said unto Balaam, Come, I pray thee, I will bring thee unto another place."). This scene had already appeared on the stage of the mystery plays. In the *Processus Prophetarum* of the Chester Cycle the stage directions read as follows:

*Tunc Balaam versus austrum.**

Tunc adducens secum Balaam in montem et ad australem partem respiciens dicat ut sequitur.

Tunc adducet eum ad borealem partem.

Ad occidentalem partem.

It will be observed that in his attempt to curse the Israelites Balaam visits the four corners of the stage, as does Hamlet. Such "business" is surely no more grotesque in *Hamlet* than it is in the Chester Play; and perhaps the convention (if it be such) may after all be traced back to the Bible.

IV

Ophelia. Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind. There, my lord.

Hamlet. Ha, ha! are you honest [=virtuous]?⁴

Hamlet's "ha, ha" is invariably printed as though it were a part of his utterance to Ophelia,—a laugh, perhaps; yet a laugh is hardly in keeping with the rest of the sentence, or with his following speech. The exclamation, I believe, is not addressed to Ophelia at all, but is an involuntary utterance of surprise, and should, therefore, be printed as an aside. At this exact moment Hamlet becomes aware of the presence of the King and Polonius in the upper gallery. Perhaps as Ophelia made her

⁴ Omitted from MS. Harl. 2124; supplied from another version.

⁵ III, i, 101-3.

most tempting speech, the eavesdroppers, in their anxiety to see, leaned forward and slightly moved the curtains.⁶ From this point on Hamlet seems to be talking not only to Ophelia, but to the King and Polonius. For example:

I am proud, revengeful, ambitious, with more offenses at my beck than . . .

Hamlet. Where's your father?

Ophelia. At home, my lord.

Hamlet. Let the doors be shut upon him, that he may play the fool no where but in's own house. . . .

Those that are married—all but one—shall live.

If this interpretation of the words "ha, ha" be right, we are helped to answer a very important question, which Professor Bradley gives up (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 157): "The question whether or no Hamlet suspects or detects the presence of listeners . . . in the absence of an authentic stage tradition . . . seems to be unanswerable."

V

Hamlet, Horatio and Marcellus are on the platform at midnight;⁷ the air bites shrewdly, for it is very cold. The three men are awaiting the coming of a ghost which, they know, invariably appears "in the dead waste and middle of the night." The clock has already struck twelve, and they are naturally somewhat nervous, with all their thoughts bent directly upon the fearful visitation that is imminent. Yet they feel, quite naturally also, that they must talk. The boom of ordinance shot off within starts the conversation about "the custom of the country" that is "more honoured in the breach than in the observance." Horatio and Marcellus are very quiet, almost inattentive, and Hamlet, uninterrupted, finally launches out into a rambling sentence of extraordinary length. It would be hard to find a sentence more involved, or more difficult to follow. Yet Hamlet, we know, could be remarkably concise and clear when he wished;

⁶This, I believe, is the way in which the scene is commonly acted on the modern stage.

⁷I, iv, 23-9.

and so could Shakespeare. The sentence runs thus:

So, oft it chances in particular men,
That, for some vicious mole of nature in them,
As in their birth—wherein they are not guilty,
Since nature cannot choose his origin—
By the o'ergrowth of some complexion,
Oft breaking down the pales and forts of reason,
Or by some habit that too much o'er-leavens
The form of plausible manners, that these men,
Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect,
Being nature's livery, or fortune's star,—
Their virtues else—be they as pure as grace,
As infinite as man may undergo—
Shall, in the general censure, take corruption,
From that particular fault: the dram of eale
Doth all the noble substance of a doubt
To his own scandal.

Is it not clear that Shakespeare *meant* for Hamlet to speak in this labyrinthine manner? Did he not construct the sentence to show us that although Hamlet keeps on talking, his mind is not on what he is saying? Furthermore, did not Shakespeare intend for the audience to lose the thought in the maze of the sentence, and, as a result, direct its whole attention anxiously to the appearance of the ghost? The sentence, I believe, shows us Shakespeare, the conscious artist, seeking to reveal the mental state of the speaker; and then, as a by-product perhaps, to focus the attention of the audience upon the entrance of a highly important character.

This interpretation of the sentence suggests certain remarks about the last clause, "dram . . . scandal," which has given so much trouble to students of the play. (1) If this clause be so emended as to make a clear, epigrammatic sentence, perfectly intelligible to every one in the audience, the effect aimed at in the long, involved sentence that precedes would be destroyed. Yet nearly all the suggested emendations have been of this nature. Thus Staunton suggests "A *dram* of ill doth all the noble substance of a *pound* to his own scandal;" and he supports this emendation by quoting two epigrams: "Where ev'ry *dram* of gold contains a *pound* of dross"—Quarles's *Emblems*; and "A *dram* of sweet is worth a *pound* of sowre"—Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. (2) It seems better to regard this clause not

as a corrupt reading of a short, pithy sentence, but rather as the beginning of another long rambling sentence, interrupted by the sudden appearance of the Ghost. If we place after the word "scandal" a dash instead of a period, we shall secure the effect evidently aimed at by the playwright in the preceding sentence.* Perhaps it would be going too far to accuse Shakespeare of having deliberately made this last phrase unintelligible; but at least that general effect seems to have been in his mind. (3) If we consider the large number of parenthetical phrases in the sentence that precedes, introduced obviously for the purpose of rendering the sentence involved and the thought obscure, we may feel inclined to favor the change of "of a doubt" to the parenthetical phrase "out o' doubt."

The sentence arranged in accordance with these suggestions would harmonize perfectly with the speech as a whole:

The dram of eale
Doth all the noble substance—out o' doubt—
To his own scandal—
Horatio. [Interrupting] Look, my lord, it comes.

VI

I give below a few changes in the text of the play as usually printed, which have suggested themselves as possible or desirable.

(a) IV, vi, 201.

Ophelia has just entered and for the first time exhibited before Laertes her pathetic madness.

"His beard was white as snow,
All flaxen was his poll:
He is gone, he is gone
And we cast away moan:
God ha' mercy on his soul!"
And of all Christian souls, I pray God,
God be wi' ye. [Exit.
Laertes. Do you see this, O God?

*This dash was suggested by J. D. M., in the *Athenæum* 1886; and Keightley, in the *Expositor*, 288, has advanced somewhat the same arguments for accepting it. The suggestion, however, seems not to have received much attention, hence I give here the line of reasoning by which I quite independently arrived at the same conclusion.

This is the usual way of printing Laertes's speech. But does he ask this question of God? Should not the line be interpreted thus?

Laer. [To King] Do you see this? O God!

(b) V, ii, 153.

Ham. What's his weapon?

Osric. Rapier and dagger.

Ham. That's two of his weapons; but, well.

The last line would be rendered more intelligible if printed thus:

Ham. That's two of his weapons.—But? Well?

That is, Osric is embarrassed by the banter to which he has been subjected, and Hamlet in his impatience is prodding him on to further speech.

(c) II, ii, 353–68.

"Nay, their endeavour keeps in the wonted pace: but there is, sir, an aery of children, little eyasses, that cry out on the top of question, and are most tyrannically clapped for't: these are now the fashion, and so berattle the common stages—so they call them—that . . .

"Will they pursue the quality no longer than they can sing? will they not say afterwards, if they should grow themselves to common players—as it is most like, if their means are no better—their writers do them wrong to make them exclaim against their own succession?"

The meaning of the passages quoted would be rendered clearer and more forceful by printing the phrases *common stages* and *common players* in marks of quotation, for the following reason. Shakespeare, in his remarks about the city players, had in mind the bitter attack upon the public playhouses made by the chapel children in 1600–1. The latter taunted their grown-up rivals with the well-known statute which classified "common players" with "rogues, vagabonds and sturdy beggars." Ben Jonson was the chief playwright for the children, and his *Cynthia's Revels* (1600) and *Poetaster* (1601) were doubtless their main attraction during the time that Shakespeare was writing *Hamlet*. These plays are very abusive of the public theatres; and in particular *Poetaster* directs most of its attack at a

wretched actor, *Histrio*, who, it is almost certain, was meant to represent the Globe company. Furthermore, in *Poetaster* Jonson points his finger directly at the Globe: "Life of Pluto! an you stage me, stinkard, your manions shall sweat for 't, your tabernacles, varlets, your *Globes*, and your Triumphs;"⁹ and twice the statute is thrust into *Histrio's* face ("They forget they are in the statute"; "I'll have the statute repealed for thee"). Most important of all, Jonson uses the specific expressions that Shakespeare quotes: "Common stages"—*Cynthia's Revels*, p. 147; "will press forth on common stages"—*Idem*, p. 176; "a tragedy of yours coming forth for the common players"—*Poetaster*, p. 211. When, therefore, Shakespeare said "so they call them," he was speaking quite literally, and marks of quotation would bring out more forcefully what he meant his audience to understand.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

ZWEI GEDICHTE VON GOETHE

I. DAS BLUTLIED

Schon in den *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Februar 1912, habe ich ein paar Notizen zu dem Liede geliefert, hier sollen die Quellen nachgewiesen werden (vgl. WA, I, 14, 310 f.).

Wo flieszet heiszes Menschen Blut
Der Dunst ist allem Zauber gut
Die grau und schwarze Brüderschaft
Sie schöpft zu neuen Wercken Kraft
Was deutet auf Blut ist uns genehm,
Was Blut vergieszt ist uns bequem.
Um Glut und Blut umkreiszt den Reihn
In Glut soll Blut vergossen seyn.

Die Dirne winckt es ist schon gut
Der Säuffer trinckt es deutet auf Blut
Der Blick der Tranck er feuert an
Der Dolch ist blanck es ist gethan.

⁹ Cunningham's ed. of Jonson in three volumes, Vol. I, p. 232. The other page references are to the same edition.

Ein Blut Quell rieselt nie allein
Es laufen andre Bächlein drein
Sie wälzen sich von Ort zu Ort
Es reizt der Strom die Ströme fort.

Der Terminus post quem für die Entstehung ist etwa der Anfang des Februar 1783. In dem damals erschienenen Heft von Gedike und Biesters *Berlinischer Monatsschrift* standen S. 151 f. in einem Reisebericht die folgenden Bemerkungen über Wallenstein:

"Von Zittau aus wandte ich mich nach Friedland und Neustädtel in Böhmen, und fand da bald die Unterthanen arm, die Häuser schlecht, und schlecht angebaute, auch wüste liegende Felder. Die Folgen von Religionszwang und Sklaverei. Mir schien es, *der Geist Wallensteins ruhe noch auf den gegenwärtigen Beamten dieser Herrschaften*. Ich besah mit einer Art von Grausen das vor dem Städtchen Friedland auf einer Anhöhe liegende alte Schloß, zu welchem zu *Frohnarbeiten* hunderte von Einwohnern aus der Ferne nach dem Schalle einer Glocke herbei eilten. Hier wars, sagte ich mir, wo Wallenstein thronte; hier wohnten seine Obersten und Anhänger, die auf seinen Wink warteten, als ihr Gebieter . . . Deutschland verwüsten, und die Erde mit Blut trinken wollte! . . . Aber bald nöthigte das Misstrauen Ferdinands (dieses allen schwachen Leuten so eigene Laster) den Wallenstein, *höhere und rebellische Gedanken zu fassen*: den er aber nachher weder abzusetzen noch zur Rede zu stellen wagte, sondern ihn auf gut asiatisch *meuchelmörderisch tödten liesz*. Wenn Wallenstein . . . der bewährten Kriegsregel gefolgt wäre, und die *Scheide weggeworfen hätte, nachdem er seinen Degen einmal gegen seinen Herrn gezogen hatte*, so glänzte heute vielleicht sein Name. . . ."

Es schloß sich (S. 153 f.) ein Gedicht an mit der Überschrift *Die Zeit*:

O Zeit wer klagte dich nicht schon!
Dir jammern Vater, Mutter, Sohn;
O Zeit, in deiner Fluthen Grab,
Rann Manche Thräne schon hinab!

Wir wogen hin, wir wogen her,
Zwar schwebend auch, doch stürzend mehr;
Kaum schwimmt auf dir das Abendroth,
Da deine Fluth schon wieder droht.

Von fernen Ufern fñhrest du
Dem Mädchen oft den Jüngling zu;
Aus Fernen sammlet oft durch dich
Der Freunde treues Häuflein sich;

Doch kaum verschränkt sich Hand in Hand,
Kaum knüpft sich schöner Seelen Band;
Noch bebt im ersten Vollgenusz
Der jungen Liebe Feuerkusz;

Da hebst du dich in deinem Lauf
Allmächtig allzerstörend auf,
Zerreisest Herzen, wälzest fort
Den einen hier, den andern dort.

Den trägst du zwar mit Wiegensang
Auf deiner Wogen Silberklang
Und führest sanft und sorgsam ihn
Zu neuen Rosenufern hin;

Doch gönnst du ihm nur kurze Lust
In Freundesarm, an Weibesbrust;
Und andre stürzt mit schneller Wuth
Zum Abgrund deine wilde Fluth.

Wenn uns nicht deines Sturms Gewühl
Hinüberfluthete zum Ziel,
Was heilte dann der Trennung Schmerz,
Was gösse Balsam uns ins Herz?

Doch wollt' es, der aus Ewigkeit
Dich ausgegossen, Strohm der Zeit,
Dass du, so stürmend du auch rollst
Dort Spiegelhell dich enden sollst.

Und nun folgte (S. 155) eine kleine Abhandlung "Über die mit Stein, Stok und Blut zusammengesetzten Wörter," aus der ich ein paar Sätze heraushebe:

"Blutsauer kommt vermuthlich von der Redensart her, da Schweisz und Blut so viel heizt, als mühsame, saure und schwere Arbeit.¹ So sagt man auch: Ich musz arbeiten, dasz ich dabei Blut schwitzen möchte. Desgleichen: Er soll arbeiten, dasz ihm das Blut aus den Fingern springe. Blutsauer würde also heissen, so sauer, dasz man dabei Blut schwitzen möchte, oder bis zum Blutvergieszen sauer. In dem Worte blutjung scheint mir blut aus Blüthe entstanden zu sein. . . . Die Niedersachsen haben noch mehrere Zusammensetzungen mit dem Worte Blut gemacht, welche bei ihnen im gemeinen Leben gewöhnlich sind, aber kaum einen verständlichen Sinn geben, und gar keinen Nachdruck haben würden, wenn man das Wort Blut als eine bloße Intension ansehen wollte, die weiter nichts bedeutete als sehr; und es würde dieses der Natur der niedersächsischen Sprache zuwider sein, welche überhaupt sehr naiv, und in ihren Zusammensetzungen sehr nachdrücklich ist. Daher glaube ich, man

müsse diese Wörter aus der figürlichen Bedeutung des Wortes Blut erklären, in welcher es das Temperament des Menschen, seine sinnlichen Triebe und Neigungen bedeutet. Man sagt: Er hat ein hitziges, feuriges Blut,² das ist, er ist von einem hitzigen feurigen Temperamente. Es steckt ihm schon im Blute. . . . So auch eine Bluthure, der es schon im Blute steckt, die nach ihrem ganzen Temperament dazu geneigt ist.—"

Die Erwähnung der harten Frondienste, die den Wallensteinschen Leibeigenen auferlegt gewesen; die Anführung von Wendungen wie "Ich musz arbeiten, dasz ich Blut schwitze, dasz mir das Blut aus den Fingern springt," endlich die Bemerkung über die Eigenheit der niedersächsischen Mundart; das alles zusammen genommen erinnerte den Leser an Vossens von häufigen sprachlichen Anmerkungen begleiteten Bauerngedichte, weiterhin an jenes in den Gedichten der niedersächsischen Bauern- und Pfarrersöhne Bürger, Voss, u.s.w. oft wiederkehrende Motiv von dem gewalttätigen Herren und dem armen Pflüger, dem Wilden Jäger, u.s.w., schliesslich, such wieder sammelnd, an eine bestimmte Dichtung, nämlich Vossens *Leibeigenschaft*, die aus zwei stark kontrastierenden Gedichten, dem düstern *Die Pferdeknechte* und dem heitern *Der Ährenkranz* bestand. So kam es, dasz aus dem letztern, den harmlos-fröhlichen ländlichen Bilde, in das grauenhafte Blutlied ein paar Verse übergingen:

Die Freyheit schenkt uns solchen Muth!
Die Dirn' ist frisch wie Milch und Blut. . . .

Die Dirne winckt es ist schon gut
Der Säufer trinckt es deutet auf Blut
Der Blick der Tranck er feuert an—

Sie stehen in dem in die Idylle eingelegten *Lied von der Freyheit* das auch zu einem andern Lied im Faust das Vorbild abgegeben hat, *Der Schäfer putzte sich zum Tanz*; man vergleiche nur die beiden ersten Strophen:

Wir bringen mit Gesang und Tanz
Dir diesen blanken Ährenkranz,
Wir Bräutigam und Braut!
Die Fiedel und Hoboe schallt!
Die Glocken gehn, und Jung und Alt
Springt hoch, und jauchzet laut!

¹ Vgl. i. d. Hexenküche, 2450 ff; und zu 2453, Blutlied 9, 12.

² Vgl. Faust, 1795.

Der Schäfer putzte sich zum Tanz,
Mit bunter Jacke, Band und Kranz,
Schmuck war er angezogen.
Schon um die Linde war es voll;
Und alles tanzte schon wie toll, . . .
So ging der Fiedelbogen.

Ebenso wurde die Gestalt des Bettlers durch
Vossens Lied geliefert:

Im blauen Tremsenkranz juchheyn,
Zu Weidenflöten und Schalmeyn
Die Kinder rund und roth;
Und schenken froh dem bleichen Mann,
Des Sklavendorfes Unterthan,
Ihr kleines Vesperbrodt!

Ihr guten Herrn, ihr schönen Frauen,
So wohlgeputzt und backenroth,
Belieb' es euch mich anzuschauen,
Und seht und mildert meine Noth! . . .
Nur der ist froh, der geben mag.
Ein Tag den alle Menschen feiern,
Er sei für mich ein Erntetag.

Der Bettler erinnert an die alte Kupplerin,
ihre Worte ergeben mit denen im Blutlied be-
kannte Bilder:

Ei! wie geputzt! das schöne junge Blut!
Wer soll sich nicht in euch vergaffen?
Nur nicht so stolz! es ist schon gut!
Und was ihr wünscht das wüßst' ich wohl zu schaffen.

Die Dirne winckt es ist schon gut
Der Säufer trinckt es deutet auf Blut
Der Blick der Tranck er feuert an
Der Dolch ist blanck es ist gethan.

Es ist schon möglich dasz Goethe an Mar-
lowes Ende gedacht hatte.

In der ersten Idylle steht unter andern die
Beschreibung der Wilden Jagd, deren einzelne
Motive sich literarisch weithin, z. B. auch in
Goethes Ungetreuen Knaben hinein, ausge-
breitet hatten. Der eine Pferdeknecht erzählt,
sein Oheim habe sie einst für die fürstliche
Jagd gehalten, und sei gegangen

Ihnen nach in die Burg. Nun denk wie der Satan
sein Spiel hat!

Jäger und Pferd' und Hunde sind Edelleute, mit
Manteln,

Langen Bärten, und eisernen Kleidern, und groszen
Perücken;

Wie die Schlaraffengesichter im Spiegelsaale des
Junkers.

Weiber mit hohen Fontanschen und Bügelröcken
und Schlentern

Fodern sie auf zum Tanz. Da rasseln die glühnde
Ketten!

Statt der Musik erschallt aus den Wänden ein
Heulen und Winseln.

Drauf wird die Tafel gedeckt. Ganz oben setzt sich
der Stammherr

Vom hochadlichen Haus', ein Straszenträuber. Sein
Beinkleid,

Wams und Bienenkapp' ist glühendes Eisen. Sie
fressen

Blutiges Menschenfleisch, und trinken siedende
Thränen.

Unsers Junkers Papa kriegt meinen Oheim zu sehen,
Nimmt den Becher voll Thränen, und bringt ihn:

Da trink' er eins, Jochen!

Jochen will nicht; er musz. Nun soll ich denn
trinken, so trink' ich,

Sagt er, in Gottes Namen! Und Knall! war alles
verschwunden.

Ich habe den Passus nicht nur wegen des
Blutlieds und der folgenden Worte des Paralipomenon,
sondern auch wegen des Lieds der Soldaten in *Faust*
herausgehoben: "Burgen mit hohen Mauern und Zinnen,
Mädchen mit stolzen höhnnenden Sinnen . . . Mädchen
und Burgen müssen sich geben. . . . Und die Soldaten
ziehen davon." Man denkt dabei ganz allgemein auch an
Egmont, und hier findet sich eine andere Parallele zum
Blutlied. Clärchen will den Geliebten aus dem Gefängnis
befreien (8, 275): "Die—Tyrannei—zücket schon den
Dolch . . . kommt wir wollen uns theilen; mit
schnellem Lauf von Quartier zu Quartier rufen wir die
Bürger heraus. . . . Auf dem Markte treffen wir uns
wieder, und unser Strom reiszt einen jeden mit sich fort.
Die Feinde sehen sich umringt und überschwemmt . . ."
Den entsprechenden Versen des Blutlieds sind wiederum
diejenigen, in denen Valentin die schnelle Karriere der
Dirne schildert, nachgeahmt:

Die Dirne winckt es ist schon gut
Der Säufer trinckt es deutet auf Blut
Der Blick der Tranck er feuert an
Der Dolch ist blanck es ist gethan.
Ein Blutquell rieselt nie allein
Es laufen andre Bächlein drein
Sie wälzen sich von Ort zu Ort
Es reiszt der Strom die Ströme fort.

Ich sag dir's im Vertrauen nur:
Du bist doch nun einmal eine Hur' . . .
Geschehn ist leider nun geschehn,
Und wie es gehn kann, so wird's gehn.
Du fängst mit Einem heimlich an,
Bald kommen ihrer mehre dran,
Und wenn dich erst ein Dutzend hat,
So hat dich auch die ganze Stadt.

Natürlich waren aber die betreffenden Blutverse ihrerseits jenen in dem bekannten Schwank von Hans Sachs angelehnt (Goetze, 255, 123 ff.):

Es kumet kein vnglueck allein,
Es sey geleich gros oder klein,
Sünder es pringt ein id vnglueck
Ein anders vnglueck auf dem rueck.

Der Zusammenhang zwischen dem Blutlied und Valentins Worten ist so natürlich wie nur möglich. Im *Urfaust* (Kerker, 53) hatte Mephisto zu Faust gesagt: "Und die Gefahr der du dich aussezzest! Wisse dasz auf der Stadt noch die Blutschuld liegt die du auf sie gebracht hast. Dasz über der Stätte des Erschlagenen rächende Geister schweben, die auf den rückkehrenden Mörder lauern." An diese Worte war Goethe bei der Lektüre jenes Reiseberichts über den Schauplatz von Wallensteins Wirken (s. oben) aufs lebhafteste erinnert worden, und im Zusammenhang mit den übrigen herzutretenden Momenten, worunter die Einlage des Freiheitslieds in Vossens Idylle, ergab sich die Idee, die rächenden Geister ihr Blutlied singen zu lassen. Dasz es über der Richtstätte ist,³ war durch Bürgers Leonore veranlaszt, wo sie um das Rad schweben:

Sieh da! sieh da! * Am Hochgericht
Tanzet, um des Rades Spindel
Halb sichtbarlich, bei Mondenlicht,
Ein luftiges Gesindel.

Vorher war dem Paar der Leichenzug begegnet: "Aus diesen Momenten hätte sich bei Goethe das Wort von der "schwarz und grauen Bruderschaft" unschwer bilden können, wenn es nicht auf lustigere Art geschehen wäre. Goethes Blutlied ist dem Inhalt nach recht nahe verwandt mit zwei Gedichten jenes jungen Schwaben, der sich vor kurzem durch das Drama *Die Räuber* und die lyrische *Anthologie auf das Jahr 1782* einen Namen gemacht hatte.

³ Zu *Urfaust*, 1440, "Sie streuen und weihen," vgl. *Egmont*, 8, 287, wo Brackenburg von den schaurigen Vorbereitungen zu Egmonts Hinrichtung spricht: "Sie schienen die Weihe eines grätzlichen Opfers vorbereitend zu begehen."

* Der Weg von diesem "Sieh da! sieh da!" bis zu demjenigen in den Kranichen des Ibykus liegt jetzt offen da.

In der letzteren begann das Gedicht *Die Pest* (Gödeke I, 299) mit den Versen

Grätzlich preisen Gottes Kraft
Pestilenzen würgende Seuchen,
Die mit der grausen Bruderschaft
Durchs öde Thal der Grabnacht schleichen,

während die Räuber (Gödeke I, 130 f) in ihrem Liede "Stehlen, morden, huren, balgen" die folgenden Verse singen:

Und haben wir im Traubensaft
Die Gurgel ausgebadet
So machen wir uns Muth und Kraft,
Und mit dem Schwarzen Bruderschaft,
Der in der Hölle bratet.

Das Wehgeheul geschlagner Väter,
Der bangen Mütter Klaggezetzer,
Das Winseln der verlasznen Braut
Ist Schmaus für unsre Trommelhaut!

Ha! wenn sie euch unter dem Beile so zuken,
Ausbrüllen wie Kälber, umfallen wie Muken,
Das kizelt unsern Augenstern,
Das schmeichelt unsern Ohren gern. . . .

Beide Stellen kombinierte Goethe, wobei die *graue* Bruderschaft neben der *schwarzen* zur *grauen* wurde. Um sicher zu gehen, vergleiche man die ganze erste Strophe des Blutlieds mit dem oben abgedruckten Passus aus dem Räuberliede. Auch steht diese Beziehung des *Faust* zu den *Räubern* durchaus nicht allein da: Ist doch z.B. das vierversige Szenenrudiment *Landstrasse* im sogenannten *Urfaust*,

Was giebt Mephisto hast du Eil?
Was schlägst vorm Kreuz die Augen nieder?
Ich weisz es wohl es ist ein Vorurtheil,
Allein genung mir ists einmal zuwider

zum Teil durch Spiegelbergs ebenfalls vierzeiliges Liedchen angeregt worden:

Memento mori! Aber das regt mich nicht an, . . .
Geh ich vorbey am Rabensteine,
So blinz ich nur das rechte Auge zu,
Und denk, du hängst mir wohl alleine,
Wer ist ein Narr, ich oder du?

und gleich darauf erzählt der dem sicheren Tode entronnene Roller: "Ihr hättet sollen—den Strik um den Hals—mit lebendigem Leib zu Grabe marschiren wie ich, und die sakermentalischen Anstalten und Schinders Cereemonien, und mit jedem Schritt, den der scheue

Fus vorwärts wankte, näher und fürchterlich näher die verfluchte Maschine, wo ich einlogirt werden sollte, im Glanz der schrecklichen Morgensonne steigend, und die laurenden Schinders-Knechte, und die gräßliche Musik—noch raunt sie in meinen Ohren—und das *Gekrächz hungriger Raben* . . . ich sag euch, wenn man aus dem glühenden Ofen ins Eiswasser springt, kann man den Abfall nicht so stark fühlen als ich, da ich am andern Ufer war . . .” womit man nun die auf das Blutlied folgenden szenischen Angaben vergleiche: *Hochgerichtserscheinung—Gedräng—Auf glühendem Boden—Nackt das Idol—Die Hände auf dem Rücken—Bedeckt nicht das Gesicht und nicht die Scham—Gesang—Der Kopf fällt ab—Das Blut springt und löscht das Feuer—Rauschen—Geschwätz von Kielkröpfen.*

Man hat natürlich anzunehmen, dasz das Lied von den Hexen gesungen wird. Nach einer früheren Bemerkung in demselben Paralipomenon wären die Hexen “zufällig wie Python” entstanden, während “die Schöpfung des Menschen durch die ewige Weisheit” vollzogen sei. Diese Anschauung des von dem ganzen Treiben angeekelten Faust hat Goethe aus einer ihm bei Haller begegneten Stelle fortgebildet, und das Bindeglied liegt in den nächsten Versen des Paralipomenon vor:

Dem Rusz der Hexen zu entgehen
Muss unser Wimpel südwärts wehen;
Doch dort bequeme dich zu wohnen
Bey Pfaffen und bey Scorpionen.

Sie bedeuten: Im Süden ist es nicht besser als im Norden; sind es hier die schwarzen und düstern, so dort die bleichen und giftigen—“Pfaffen und Skorpionen” ein Hendiadyoin dem “Rusz der Hexen” auf der andern Seite entsprechend—Ausgeburten des Menschengeistes, seines Aberglaubens, von dem Haller (*Versuch schw. Ged.*, Göttingen 1768, S. 55) an Stähelin sang:

Diess ist der grösste Gott, ver dem die Welt sich
bückt.⁵
Die Götzen, die man ehrt, und auf Altären schmückt,
Sind, bunten Farben gleich, nur Theile seines Lichts,⁶

⁵ Vgl. WA, 14, 306, 11 ff.

⁶ Vgl. *Faust*, 1336, 1349 ff.

Sie selbst sind nur durch Ihn, und ausser Ihm ein Nichts.

*Sie sind im Wesen eins, nur an Gestalt verschieden,
Weiss unterm blanken Nord, schwarz unterm braunen
Süden;*

Dort grimmig, ihr Getränk ist warmes Menschen-
Blut,

Hier gütig, etwas Gold versöhnet ihre Wuth.

Doch ein verwöhnt Paris, dem Argenson nicht wehret,
Zeugt so viel Diebe nicht, als Götter man verehret;
Kein Thier ist so verhasst, kein Scheusal so veracht,
Dem nicht ein Volk gedient, und Bilder sind gemacht.
Den trägt hier ein Altar, der dort am Galgen hängt,
Das heisse Persen ehrt die Sonne, die es sänget;
Das tumme Memphis sucht im Sumpf den Crocodill,
Und räuchert einem Gott, der es verschlingen will . .
Des bösen Wesen selbst, des Schadens alter Freund,⁷
Hat Kirchen auf der Welt und Priester, wie sein
Feind.⁸

Entsetzlicher Betrug! vor solchen Ungeheuern
Kniert die verführte Welt, und lernet Teufel feyern. . .
Für seines Gottes Ruhm gilt Meineid und Verrath;
Was böses ist geschehn, das nicht ein Priester that?

Man sieht, dieser Passus, dessen Beziehung zu der Teufelsanbetung der Walpurgisnacht zu Tage liegt, hat ebenfalls eine Wendung für das Blutlied geliefert, dessen Spuren an mehreren Stellen des *Faust* zu beobachten sind—im Verein mit dem Gedicht *Die Zeit* z.B. in den Versen 11339–11383; dann natürlich auch in den hier in Betracht kommenden Abschnitten des ersten Theils, z.B. 4191; und wenn ebendort (4183 ff) auch aus dem Gespräche zwischen Schildwache und Freund Hain Reminiscenzen unterlaufen, so erklärt sich das sofort, wenn man neben dies Gespräch das Lied von der Zeit und das Blutlied hält.

Ich denke, es ist so gut wie sicher, dasz das Blutlied direkt unter dem Eindruck der ersten Lektüre des genannten Hefts der Berliner Monatsschrift entstanden ist: der sonstige Inhalt des Hefts war nicht danach,⁹ dasz Goethe Veranlassung gehabt hätte, es zu anderer Zeit als eben gleich nach dem Erscheinen durch-

⁷ Vgl. *Faust*, 1337.

⁸ Vgl. WA, 14, 306 ff.

⁹ S. 168 steht noch ein Aufsatz “Vergleichung der Aktion des Predigers mit der des Schauspielers” mit dem entgegengesetzten Resultat als es *Urfaust*, 174 festgesetzt war. S. 189 von Biester: “Ist Kursachsen das Tribunal der Sprache und Literatur für die übrigen Provinzen Deutschlands?” nicht von Belang.

zulesen, es später noch einmal vorzunehmen. Auch die oben aufgedeckten Beziehungen zu den Räufern beweisen dass die Meinung unserer Faustforscher, in der ersten Weimarer Periode sei am *Faust* nicht gearbeitet worden, hinfällig ist, wie denn ihre ganze Urfaust-Chronologie sich mir bei meinen Arbeiten als ein Kartenhaus gezeigt hat.

St. Andrews (Scotland).

G. SCHAAFFS.

THE ARRAIGNMENT OF PARIS AND SIXTEENTH CENTURY FLATTERY

Prof. F. E. Schelling, in a note on *The Arraignment of Paris* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, VIII, 207), suggested that Peele's converting the story of Ate and the golden apple into an elaborate compliment to Elizabeth probably owed its inspiration to the lines in Gascoigne's *Vanities of Bewtie*:

"This Queene it is who, had she sat in feeld
When Paris judged that Venus bare the bell,
The prize was hers, for she deserved it well."

There are, however, other "suggestions" for the compliment. Indeed the device seems to have been almost a common-place of sixteenth century flattery.¹ Creizenach (*Geschichte*, IV, 45) has recently pointed out that in 1569 Lucas de Heere in a picture at Hampton Court represented Queen Elizabeth standing triumphant before Juno, Minerva and Venus who, we are told, are "beschämt und überwunden" in the presence of so much beauty. And Reyher (*Les Masques Anglais*, 390) and Creizenach (*Geschichte*, 45) have both noted in connection with *The Arraignment* Udall's pageant prepared for the coronation of Elizabeth's mother in 1533. This ingenious little "show" was exhibited "at the Little Conduete in Chepe Side in maner and forme following:" Mercury sent from Jupiter presents a golden apple to Paris which the latter is to award to the most

beautiful of the three goddesses. Juno promises him the best of "all riches and kingdoms" to decide in her favor. Pallas promises "incomparable wisdom," Venus "the fairest ladie that on erthe is." Paris decides in favor of Venus, but with the words,

"Yet, to be plain,
Here is the fouerthe lady now in presence,
Most worthie to have it of due congruence,
As pereles in riches, wit, and beautee,
Whiche are but sundry qualities in you three,
But for hir worthynes, this aple of gold
Is to symple a reward a thousand fold."

This last idea is taken up and elaborated in "The Conclusion of this Pageant pronounced by a Child," wherein it is stated that a worthier reward awaits Queen Anne in the form of "a crown imperiall with glorie ymmortall." At the departure of the Queen a "balad" was sung in which Anne is again assured that of all ladies she is most deserving of the gift, but as the golden ball is too "lowe and bace" for her worthiness it will be presented to Venus. Yet in spite of all this, it appears that the ball was actually presented to Anne in the name of the three goddesses. This is brought out in the descriptive words of Leland² accompanying Udall's verse and in the contemporary accounts of the pageant. The description printed by Wynkyn de Worde (*Arber, Eng. Garner*, II, 48) mentions "a costly and rich pageant; whereat was goodly harmony of music and other minstrels, with singing. And within that pageant were five costly seats wherein were set these five personages, that is to wit, Juno, Pallas, Mercury, Venus and Paris; who having a ball of gold presented it to her grace [Anne] with certain verses of great honour; and children singing a ballad to her Grace, and praise to all her ladies." Hall's account (*Chronicle*, p. 802) is very similar. Before the three deities stood Mercury who "in the name of the iii goddesses" gave to the Queen "a balle of gold devided in thre, signifying thre giftes ye

¹ For an interesting case of a later use of the "conceit" see Phoebus' song in III, i of *The Maydes Metamorphosis*.

² The Pageant, etc., is printed in Nichols' *Prog. of Eliz.*, ed. of 1805, Vol. I, p. xv; Furnivall, *Ballads from Manuscript*, I, 379-401; *Arber, Eng. Garner*, II, 52-60.

which thre Goddesses gave to her, that is to saye, wysedome, ryches and felicittee." Holinshed (*Chronicle*, III, 782) copies Hall.

With these accounts should be compared a much earlier one, for it appears that the "show" was not original with Udall. When Elizabeth's aunt, Margaret, the daughter of Henry VII, was married in 1503 to the Scots King, she was received at Edinburgh with great ceremony. In one pageant an angel presented to her the keys of the city; and near the town cross "was a Scarfawst [Scarfawlt?] maid, wher was represented Paris and the Thre Deessys, with Mercure, that gaffe hym the apyll of gold, for to gyffe to the most fayre of the Thre, whiche he gave to Venus" (Leland, *Collectanea*, Ed. of 1770, IV, 289). We can rest assured that the apple was presented with the understanding that Margaret really deserved it, for otherwise such a pageant on such an occasion would have been without point.

Now if we must find a suggestion for Peele's flattery, where shall we turn? His device differs pretty widely from the earlier ones. One may raise the question, too, whether he ever saw the manuscript containing Udall's production. But the same question also arises in connection with Gascoigne's poem. Hall and Holinshed were well known, as no doubt was Wynkyn de Worde's account of Anne's coronation; and it is certainly more conceivable that their descriptions, bald though they be, are abler candidates for suggestion than is the general statement by Gascoigne. At least it is reasonable to suppose that interested as he was in pageants and pageantry, Peele certainly knew through some source or another—perhaps an account more detailed than any mentioned above—the devices at Anne's coronation or at the reception of Margaret into Edinburgh. To me, however, the significance of Udall's show at the little conduit and the pageant of the unknown Scot lies not in their direct connection with Peele's production, but in the fact that long before *The Arraignment* the same classic material had been used to compliment the mother, and no doubt the aunt, as extravagantly as it was later used, in a different and more effective manner, to tickle the

vanity of Elizabeth. The nature of the device is, I feel, such as might have occurred independently to various poets during a century of classicism and flattery.

T. S. GRAVES.

The University of Washington.

LONGFELLOW AND SCHILLER'S *LIED VON DER GLOCKE*

When Longfellow's *Building of the Ship* was published, his friends recognized in it a close relationship to Schiller's *Lied von der Glocke* which, as they well knew, was so much admired by the American poet. It is not at all necessary to offer proofs of this admiration. His acquaintance with Schiller's work was of early date, and he read it repeatedly with his classes in German at the university, and always with keen delight. His own poem is related to Schiller's in both spirit and form, but chiefly in spirit.

The central bond of both poems is the detailed description of the production of a masterpiece by a master and his workmen. Furthermore, this masterpiece of craft has in each case a symbolic meaning. In the one is symbolized the American Republic riding the stormy political seas of the ante-bellum period, when prophets were not wanting on both sides of the Atlantic, who foretold the destruction of democratic institutions in the impending crisis; in the other the peace of Europe after the wild orgies of the French Revolution.

The German poem has, however, a series of pictures of human life in its typical forms from birth till death, all associated directly with the functions of the bell. The American has but a single episode of this kind, the story of the love of the ship-builder's daughter and his apprentice, yet this is broken up into a series of pictures, such as: the betrothal, the maiden standing before her father's door watching the work, the twilight scene where the maiden rests her head on her lover's breast, her form used as the model for the image carved by her lover

to adorn the ship's bows, the bridals celebrated on board the finished vessel, every stage of the story being linked either naturally or symbolically with the making and launching of the ship. In spirit there is no doubt of the kinship, and the influence of Schiller is as certainly shown as any literary influence can well be.

In form, however, the kinship is less marked. In Schiller's poem the description of the casting of the bell is kept absolutely separate from the panorama of human life associated with it, except for the inevitable philosophic sentences in any of Schiller's best work. The Song of the Bell proper is a series of strophes or stanzas of like form making a unity which could exist without the typical pictures, which are inserted as a series of antistrophes of unequal length between the successive pairs of stanzas. In Longfellow's poem the building of the ship is completely blended with the love episode and the symbolic references are scattered throughout. The only approach to an accompanying strain like Schiller's is the twice repeated song:

Build me straight, O worthy master!
 Staunch and strong, a goodly vessel,
 That shall laugh at all disaster,
 And with wave and whirlwind wrestle!

with an additional variant:

In the shipyard stood the master,
 With the model of the vessel,
 That should laugh at all disaster,
 And with wave and whirlwind wrestle!

The whole metrical movement of Longfellow's poem, beginning with:

Behold at last
 Each tall and tapering mast,

and running through more than a hundred verses, in fact up to the final apostrophe to the Union:

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!

announces unmistakably to eye and ear its essential kinship with the antistrophic meters of the *Lied*. Swift verses, rimed, of varying length, intended generally to conform to and express the mood and content, are common to both poems. Possibly even finer shades of like-

ness might be pointed out as results of Longfellow's complete assimilation of the model, but this is sufficient.

But Schiller's poem did not cease to mould Longfellow's poetry with the closing of this one poem. Again after a score or more of years the formative influence is felt. When writing the Second Interlude of *Christus*, in 1871, Longfellow translated Luther's hymn, *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*, and cast between successive stanzas a series of antistrophes, poetical glosses, presenting Luther's attitude toward the Reformation and its leaders. Two years later, 1873, the beautiful poem, *The Hanging of the Crane*, shows again a series of strophes and antistrophes, the strophes, however, being more disconnected than in the previous case, and somewhat dependent upon the intervening antistrophes for their full appreciation. The series of beautiful scenes from happy domestic life betrays a kinship of content with Schiller's poem, but there is no borrowing, for Longfellow's pictures are partly personal and wholly American. The metrical regularity is more severe than that of the German poem. Still later, in *Keramos*, 1877, is shown the lasting formal influence of Schiller's *Lied*. This is a poem of the strictest regularity of structure and beauty of melody. Here the Potter's Song is as strict a unity in itself as the master bell-caster's, and as in Schiller, the operations of a particular industry are made symbolic of human life in its various phases, though the symbolism is contained in the Potter's Song proper, rather than in the accompanying panoramic antistrophes. These latter are sketchy scenes from the world-romance of the fictile arts, of which the only unity is that of an imaginary flight on the wings of the song itself, from land to land, wherever any notable pottery works exist or have existed.

With this, almost at the close of his life, the productive impulse from Schiller's poem seems to have ceased; the few remaining years of Longfellow's active literary career show no further traces of its form or spirit.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL.

University of Michigan.

BANDELLO AND *THE BROKEN HEART*

The latest word in regard to the source of *The Broken Heart* is, I believe, from Mr. S. P. Sherman (*Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.*, June, 1909), who advances the theory that instead of adapting some Italian tale, as Ellis suggests, Ford based his play on the story of Sidney and Lady Penelope Rich (Stella), using a Spartan setting to disguise an English love affair. In choosing this setting, Ford, according to Mr. Sherman, was following in the footsteps of Sidney himself, who in *Arcadia* had familiarized the public with the same imaginary Sparta as a background for the same type of incidents as Ford's. Mr. Sherman makes out a strong case even if it is impossible to reduce the matter to a certainty; but probably he goes too far in disregarding the Italian flavor which others detect in the play. The *Astrophel-Stella* story would account only for the forced marriage of Penthea in *The Broken Heart*, and room would still be left for a decided Italian influence on the other important complications of the play. There seems no reason, in fact, why Ford, with the story of *Astrophel* and *Stella* in mind, wishing to set forth the danger of interference in matters of the heart, may not have drawn his treatment from Italian romance, to which the theme is at least appropriate. At any rate, *Bandello*, one of whose novels furnished Ford, possibly directly, with the device of the chair that imprisons Ithocles, has a second novel, the story of Livio and Camilla (I, 33), which may well have furnished suggestions for *The Broken Heart* to a dramatist who adapts with so free a hand as Ford. This novel is translated into French by Belleforest in his *Histoires Tragiques* (No. 22), and into English, through Belleforest, by Fenton in his *Tragicall Discourses* (Discourse II).

The portion of *Bandello's* story that is of interest for *The Broken Heart* runs as follows. Livio and Camilla having become desperately enamored of each other, Livio seeks the consent of the girl's father to their marriage. The old man readily agrees to a betrothal, but adds the condition that his son Claudio, who is then

at Rome, shall on his return sanction the match. The lovers regard the matter as settled, and, while the brother's coming is long delayed, their love, unrestrained, grows apace. But Claudio, on his return, objects to the match without reason, and persuades the father to withdraw his consent. The remainder of the story bears no relation to Ford's play except that the brother's opposition results in a tragedy involving his death and that of the two lovers. For Livio and Camilla, who hold the pledge that has passed between them as binding as marriage, taking matters into their own hands, enter into a secret contract, as a result of which Livio dies of excessive joy and Camilla, overcome with grief, expires by his corpse. Claudio, in fierce anger against Camilla's maid for her part in the intrigue, kills her with his sword, and is put to death for his crime.

In *The Broken Heart*, the theme of a brother's interference in the love affairs of his sister appears in two forms. Penthea is by her father Thrasus contracted to Orgilus. In consequence, Orgilus tells his father (I, 1),

A freedom of converse, an interchange
Of holy and chaste love, so fixed our souls
In a firm growth of union, that no time
Can eat into the pledge.

But on the death of Thrasus, Penthea's brother Ithocles, nursing an old enmity, disregards the contract, and forces his sister into a hateful marriage with Bassanes. Penthea, however, considers herself the wife of Orgilus, upbraids her brother as the cause of her wretchedness, and broods over what she terms her adulterous marriage to Bassanes, till death rids her of the bond. But the interference of Ithocles leads to a tragedy involving his death and that of his own betrothed, Calantha, who dies of a broken heart upon her lover's corpse, after the manner of Camilla. Orgilus, like Claudio, is condemned to death for his part in the tragedy of these last two lovers. The death of Calantha in Ford's play is sufficiently striking as a catastrophe to make the coincidence of Camilla's similar end at least interesting.

In the love of Prophilus and Euphranea,

Ford's second variation on the subject of a brother's authority over a sister in the matter of marriage, the other side of the picture is presented. Orgilus, ostensibly leaving for Athens,—compare Claudio's sojourn at Rome,—exacts from his father and from his sister Euphranea an oath that the girl shall not marry without his consent. Immediately after his departure, Euphranea falls in love with Prophilus. The father sanctions the match for his own part, but stipulates that the marriage must depend upon his son's consent. When Orgilus returns home, he finds, however, that his consent has been taken for granted by the lovers and by the court in general. Though he is strongly tempted to interfere,—for the marriage is distasteful to him because Prophilus is the bosom friend of Ithocles, who, exercising a brother's authority, has robbed Orgilus of his own mate Penthea,—in the end he refrains from doing violence to his sister's heart, and the revels in honor of Euphranea's happy marriage to Prophilus furnish the background of gayety which deepens the gloom of the tragedies growing out of the tyranny of Ithocles toward his sister.

If Ford borrowed the device of the chair directly from *Bandello* or *Belleforest* instead of through an adaptation such as *Barnes's Devil's Charter*, there is no reason why he should not have known, also, the story of Livio and Camilla either in the original or in the French version. This particular story he might easily have known through Fenton, but Fenton does not translate the novel in which the fatal chair appears. As between the Italian and the French or English versions, assuming that Ford used this tale at all for *The Broken Heart*, I should say that the French or English was the more likely source; for *Belleforest*, followed closely by Fenton, greatly enlarges *Bandello's* terse narrative, naturally not so much by filling in details in regard to events as by enhancing the subjective interest, so that his version seems nearer to the spirit of Ford's play. Thus, in both translations, when the lovers find the marriage to which they have so confidently looked forward balked by Claudio's unreasonable opposition, Camilla bursts forth into a

monologue of great length, inveighing against the tyranny of her brother and the iniquity of thwarting inclination in marriage. "How can I refuse that wherof is passed alrebye a confirmacion,"—I quote Fenton,—“or admit other husband then hee to whom I ham bounde by vowe of consente?” Her father, she protests, has already “paste th'accorde” between herself and Livio, and her brother has no privilege to give laws to her fancy. She vows never to be “bestowed in an other place by his appointment,” but to yield herself to him only to whom she has pawned her faith. Again, in the enlarged form of the tale, great stress is laid on the power of excessive emotion over life, whether of joy or of grief. It is said in the argument: “And like as a vehement and inward greffe of the mynd . . . is of such force to close the poares and conduictes of the vitall partes of man, that, cancelling the commission of lyfe, the soule departes leaving the body without sence; like power, I saye, hath the vehemencie of semblable gladnes,” etc. A number of ancient examples of death from joy or sorrow are then cited, among them that of the daughter-in-law of the High Priest Eli, who is said to have died of grief at the news of her husband's sudden end. It seems at least possible that the emphasis on this manner of death attracted Ford's attention to the theme.

The events of *Bandello's* story are said to have taken place during the papacy of Alexander VI (1492–1503), and there is a circumstantial account of how Claudio was put to death by order of Catalano, governor of Cesena under Caesar Borgia. Fenton, whose translation appeared in 1567, is apparently responsible for the express statements that the story is of undoubted truth and that the affair “doth not exceed the remembrance of our time.” Though I know of no corroborative evidence, the tale of these two lovers may have been well known, and may have had some foundation in fact. If so, it is just possible that we have here the basis of Ford's claim in the prologue,

What may be here thought Fiction, when time's youth
Wanted some riper years, was known a Truth.

C. R. BASKERVILL.

The University of Chicago.

Widsith: A Study in Old English Heroic Legend, by R. W. CHAMBERS, M. A., Fellow and Librarian of University College, London. Cambridge University Press, 1912.

Around this poem of one hundred and forty-three lines, Mr. Chambers has written a book nearly as long as Mr. Chadwick's *Origin of the English Nation*, with which it is uniform in size and binding. No student of the *Widsith* will question the propriety of this minute examination. It is abundantly warranted, in the first place, by the great importance and interest of the subject-matter. No single vernacular document, not even *Beowulf*, throws clearer light upon early Germanic ethnography and saga. The significance of its briefest references is far-reaching; and these references cannot be explained in a few words. Again, the poem presents many difficulties of interpretation. Various problems, exceedingly complicated in themselves, have engaged the attention of critics for years, and any careful survey of the piece is bound to consider these conflicts of scholarly opinion, to sift the wheat from the chaff, and to assign credit where credit is due. This task Mr. Chambers has performed exceedingly well. The footnotes and references show how little has been taken for granted, how carefully even minor issues have been guarded. The editor is, if anything, over-conscientious in giving credit to his predecessors, and in noting all his sources of information. In short, the surprising thing is not that the book is so long, but, considering its completeness, that it is so short. It is not only a practically definitive edition of *Widsith*; it is a cyclopedia of Germanic saga. Its pages generally give the effect of conciseness, and it contains little that the expert would wish omitted.

In a book dealing with so many controversial matters, there are naturally some statements from which the reader will dissent. On the whole, however, the decisions of disputed questions display sound judgment. Criticism of details is not, in any case, the object of the present review, but rather an explanation of the general plan and scope of the volume. A

general outline is afforded by the opening chapter, entitled "Widsith and the German Heroic Age." One or two matters are provisionally settled at the outset,—that the piece is not genuine autobiography, and that it is more or less interpolated.

"Our poem . . . reflects a definitely marked period: that of those barbarian invasions of the Roman Empire, which began when the Goths first swarmed across the frontier, and ended with Alboin's falling upon an Italy worn by famine, pestilence and the sword of Visigoth, Hun, Vandal and Ostrogoth. Whether *Widsith* is to be regarded as the work of one man, or as a cento of several heroic catalogues, need not for the moment trouble us; for, though the various sections of the poem may show minor idiosyncrasies, they all reflect the same heroic age. Excluding the lines of Biblical lore, we are left with a poem recording the tribes and chiefs of the German migrations, from the middle of the third to the middle of the sixth century: from Ostrogotha to Alboin."

The following chapter summarizes the epic material connected with the Gothic and Burgundian heroes whom Widsith has supposedly visited. Here it is noteworthy that the editor recognizes that the key to the Eormenric-Ealhild passage lies in regarding Ealhild as the wife, not of Eadgils, but of Eormanric (pp. 21 ff). He is also right, I think, in identifying the hero of l. 115 with Theodoric of Verona, rather than with the Frankish king mentioned in l. 24. In chapter III, which is entitled "Tales of the Sea-Folk, of the Franks and Lombards," particular attention is paid to Offa of Angel, Eadgils, Wade, Hagen and Heoden, Breca, and Theodoric the Frank. Sceafa, Ægelmund, Æfwine and Eadwine are naturally the prominent Lombard heroes. Mr. Chadwick's treatment of the Breca-episode makes it clear that this is still imperfectly understood. His summaries of the available information about the heroes of saga are almost uniformly satisfying, and occasionally his comments are singularly felicitous, as for example in regard to the tragic elements in *Beowulf*. "We cannot rightly understand *Beowulf* unless we realise the background against which the hero is depicted. The poet meant *Beowulf* to stand out in contrast to the masters of

Heorot, a house of heroes second to none in all northern story, but tainted by incest¹ and the murder of kin almost beyond the measure of the lords of Thebes or the house of Pelops. So he depicts in his hero loyalty, duty, subordination of his own fortunes to those of his chief. *Widsith* shows us that it was this terrible and tragic tale which the old poets associated with the name of the hall Heorot, rather than that figure of Beowulf the monster-queller which the later poet has chosen to paint in the foreground."

The present reviewer is perhaps hardly qualified to speak impartially of Chapter IV, "Widsith and the Critics," since some of his own views in regard to the structure of the poem are here combated at some length. The fundamental question at issue here is, after all, one of method. Mr. Chambers favors a return to the methods of Müllenhoff and his followers. To those who distrust those methods he replies that arguments about plurality of authorship must define the exact scope of the interpolations in a given poem. "It is therefore the duty of a critic who believes a poem or play to be the work of several hands," he says, "to form a hard and definite theory, consistent with the facts that he has noted. The law of chance is against his theory being right in every detail. But a critic who is quite clear in his own mind as to exactly what he is trying to prove may often prove his general theory, even though we are in doubt as to many of the details. If he confines himself to generalities he will prove nothing."—Mr. Chambers here seems to have fallen under the spell of a fallacy which destroys the value of much "higher criticism." Precise and definite results give an air of scientific exactness, but when such exactness is by the very nature of the problem impossible, it is surely not indicative of "vagueness and confused thinking" to indicate in a general way such stylistic discrepancies as lead to the belief that a poem is the work of different hands, and abandon the attempt to fix definite boundaries. The second part of *Absalom and*

Achitophel, for example, is the combined work of Dryden and Tate. Lines 310–509 are generally believed, on the authority of Tonson, to have been written by Dryden. For the rest of the poem, the critic may surely with far more propriety point out lines or passages which appear to him reminiscent of one author or the other, and assert in a general way duality of composition, than assign fixed limits to the work of each.

Mr. Chambers dissents also from the results of Chadwick, Brandl, and Siebs, agreeing, in the main, with the theories of ten Brink. The most cursory examination of this chapter will illustrate strikingly the wide range of argument and conjecture as to the structure of the poem. That the end is not yet at hand is obvious from a recent review,² which gives hints of the nature of a forthcoming article on *Widsith* for Hoops' *Reallexicon für germanische Altertumskunde*.

Two shorter chapters follow, one treating of geography, the other of language and meter. Considerable space is devoted to the vexed question of the location of the country of the Myrings, to which is added further material in an appendix. Mr. Chadwick is inclined to identify it phonetically with the "Maurungani" of the Geographer of Ravenna, and to place it "south of the Eider in the modern Holstein." A general survey of the geography suggests the point of view of a gleeman of ancient Angel, and leads to the conclusion that the poem was made not long after the invasion of Britain, "whilst the traditions of the continental home were still fresh." Moreover, the geography confirms us in the belief "that *Widsith* cannot have any autobiographical basis, but that it represents an exceedingly early form of traditional lore, and that certain portions, which can be defined with some accuracy, are likely to be later interpolations." An excellent map at the end of the book makes the positions of the various peoples much clearer, and still another map traces the course followed by the voyager Ohthere. A study of the grammar of the poem reveals, according to Mr. Chambers,

¹ Is this reproach, as Mr. Chambers states it, justified?

² R. Jordan, *Englische Studien*, Vol. 45, pp. 300 ff.

instances of late usage in just those portions which earlier critics had been inclined to treat as accretions and interpolations, while the undoubted portions are primitive in grammar and metrical form.

"Reason has been shown," says the author, in the closing chapter, "for believing that these undoubted portions of the poem fall into two sections, originally distinct, the Catalogue of Kings, and the lay of Ealhild and Eormanric which we may regard as the essential *Widsith*. *Widsith*, alike on grounds of legend and geography, cannot be the work of a contemporary of Eadgils and Ealhild who really visited the court of Eormanric. The Catalogue of Kings is older than *Widsith* proper, yet on account of the names it contains it can hardly be earlier than the middle of the sixth century, and may be considerably later. *Widsith* seems to belong to a period later than this, but earlier than *Beowulf* or *Genesis*: that is, to the seventh century."

How far the minuteness of Mr. Chambers' studies have been from blinding him to the literary significance of the poem is well seen in his closing comments on its place in the history of Germanic verse. He feels that it reveals to us "the stock-in-trade of the old Anglian bard," and that "it demonstrates the dignity of the Old English narrative poetry, and of the common Germanic narrative poetry of which the Old English was but a section." Perhaps he is inclined to underrate the seriousness of *Beowulf*, and to over-emphasize the essentially childish *märchen*-plot, but he does not overrate the tragic power of the tales linked with the names of the heroes of *Widsith*. A review of his admirable book may fittingly close with the final sentences, a defence, if any there need be, for such minute and searching labor as his. "In the old heroic poetry we get a glimpse of the thoughts of those men whose unrecorded lives and deaths have done more to the building up of Europe than have the intrigues and quarrels of their lords. This should render sacred not only every recorded line of the old poems, but every paraphrase and every allusion."

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.

Columbia University.

Euvres de François Rabelais, édition critique publiée par ABEL LEFRANC, JACQUES BOULENGER, HENRI CLOUZOT, PAUL DORVEAUX, JEAN PLATTARD et LAZARE SAINÉAN. Tome premier: *Gargantua* (Prologue—Chapitres I–XXII). Paris, Champion, 1912. clvi + 214 pp.

M. Abel Lefranc is held in grateful remembrance by so many American students of the Romance languages that a book fathered by him is sure to receive a royal welcome in this country. The fine quarto volume before us comprises two diametrically opposed parts. There is, first, in beautiful large print, an *Etude de Gargantua* by M. Lefranc himself, supplemented by two essays, *L'Education de Gargantua* and *Thélème*, by M. Plattard, all of which any layman, interested in Rabelais, might read with the greatest of pleasure. The text here given, with its modern punctuation, capitalization and alignment, he might also enjoy reading. On the other hand, there are the voluminous notes in finer print, so voluminous that if read with the text as they are intended to be, running parallel with it, Rabelais himself is quite lost from sight. The reading of Rabelais becomes a study in the history of civilization, in archeology, in philology, in anything but Rabelais as literature. For simple pleasure in Rabelais, in the play of his imagination, in his pithily expressed and wise philosophy, in his marvelous gift of language, we must fall back on our old Burgaud des Marets and Rathery.

The question, therefore, immediately arises why there should be in a scholarly edition the slightest modernization of Rabelais' text. M. Boulenger,¹ after an examination of the ten editions of *Gargantua* that appeared during the life-time of Rabelais, decides that the last edition revised² by Rabelais (E) should form the basis of a critical edition. This text (E) is the same as that published by Marty-Laveaux, but Marty-Laveaux reproduces it with-

¹ Intro., pp. cvii–cxviii.

² Lyon, F. Juste, 1542.

out alteration, claiming that if the original orthography is to be kept, much more should the old punctuation, because the punctuation affects the thought more than the orthography.⁵ In Rabelais' case at any rate, we are inclined to believe he is right. Compare, if you will, the opening lines of Ch. I. In M. Lefranc's edition we have: "Je vous remectz à la grande chronique Pantagrueline reconnoistre la genealogie et antiquité dont nous est venu Gargantua. En icelle vous entendrez plus au long comment, etc. . . . , et ne vous faschera si pour le present je m'en deporté, combien que la chose soit telle que, tant plus seroit remembrée, tant plus elle plairoit à vos Seigneuries; comme," etc. With the period after *deporté* and *combien* beginning with a capital as in the untampered text, we seem to catch a different impression of the sequence of Rabelais' thought. He seems to say: ". . . and don't be provoked if (therefore) I refrain from giving it now. Although (when I come to think of it) it is a subject," etc. On account of such possible differences in interpretation, it is probable that Marty-Laveaux' edition will still remain indispensable to the student of Rabelais. It is unfortunate that all excellencies cannot be combined, for this new edition has the great advantage over its predecessor in giving all the variants of A, B and D⁴ just below the text, whereas in the edition of Marty-Laveaux, only the important ones are given, and these are hidden in the Commentary in Volume iv.

In *L'Etude de Gargantua*, M. Lefranc gathers the results of all the recent researches upon the subject of Rabelais and his time, and focuses them upon *Gargantua* until the manner and time of its composition and its full significance are more fully revealed to us than ever before. Throughout, no name of place or person is treated lightly. "Quant à Brizepaille," says Marty-Laveaux,⁵ "il faut, je crois, ne point s'évertuer à le chercher sur la carte." Not so M. Lefranc. He not only locates Brise-

paille,⁶ but he is so convinced that Rabelais is building upon personal reminiscences of his youth that he is willing to affirm that "L'orde vieille, venue de Brizepaille d'auprès Saint-Genou, soixante ans auparavant, est sûrement la femme qui assista les accouchées de la famille."⁷ We wonder whether even in the sixteenth century a man of property and importance in the community, such as Rabelais' father,⁸ would employ an "orde vieille" in this capacity. The searching of archives has resulted so successfully in the reconstitution of Gargantua as a tale woven by Rabelais out of real stuff that almost with surprise we read later on in the notes that there still remain a few names "*qu'il est apparemment inutile de chercher à identifier.*"⁹

In the interesting discussion of the various Gargantua stories and their relation to Rabelais' work, the conclusion reached does not differ greatly from that of Marty-Laveaux. M. Lefranc is somewhat more reluctant to allow that Rabelais had any part in the edition of the *Grandes et inestimables Croniques*: Marty-Laveaux concludes that Rabelais "refit une facétie traditionnelle"¹⁰ for the publisher, and M. Lefranc grants that "peut-être il l'a relue pour lui, et un peu arrangée et corrigée."¹¹ M. Lefranc's opinion on this point has, therefore, notably changed since he wrote *Les Navigations de Pantagruel*.¹²

In spite of the charm of M. Lefranc's exposition, we hesitate at times to follow him. We are willing to grant that Grandgousier and Gargamelle had to a certain extent the grandparents of Rabelais as prototypes, and that they lived at La Devinière.¹³ We are willing to accept the deduction that Rabelais was born at La Devinière, près de Chinon,¹⁴ and not at Chinon as we had good reason to believe.¹⁵

⁵ Ch. VI, n. 29.

⁷ Intro., p. lviii.

⁸ Cf. M. Lefranc in *RER.*, 1904, pp. 291-292.

⁹ Ch. XX, n. 24.

¹⁰ Vol. v, p. xxiv; cf. Vol. iv, pp. 19 and ff.

¹¹ Intro., p. xlii.

¹² P. 194, n.

¹³ Intro., p. lv.

¹⁴ Intro., p. cxxviii under [1494].

¹⁵ Marty-Laveaux, Vol. v, p. v (1902).

⁴ *Œuvres de Rabelais*, éd. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. I, p. v.

⁵ The 1537 edition published at Lyons (C), is found to be only a reprint of B.

⁶ Cf. Vol. iv, p. 83.

But we cannot get far enough away from the familiar story to admit that Grandgousier and Gargamelle were not giants.¹⁶ The "à peine trois ou quatre traits" given in the foot note, would alone be ample indications that they were quite out of the pale of ordinary mortals. But was not the famous mule with a tail alone more than seventy feet long and twelve feet square, sent in three boats from over seas as a present to Grandgousier (I, xvi)? Did not even the cabbage and lettuce in his garden grow so tall that men could hide in them (I, xxxviii)? In short, could any woman but a giantess give birth through the ear to a child that required to feed him the milk of 17,913 cows? The fact that Grandgousier is represented "se chauffant à un beau, clair et grand feu, recevant ses amis, ou buvant ou dînant ou priant dans son lit,"¹⁷ does not militate in the slightest against his being a giant.

Again, we are willing to admit that Rabelais made a visit to the scenes of his childhood before he began to write his Gargantua, and that this accounts for the Gargantua's offering "un caractère presque exclusivement chinonais";¹⁸ that it was after this visit that he inserted in the second edition of his Pantagruel¹⁹ the speech of Panurge "en langage lanternois," in which are mentioned Gravot, Chavigny, la Pomardièrre, la Devinière and [Ci]nays, but we find it difficult to make out that "le second livre ne renferme aucune allusion aux gens ni aux choses du pays de l'Auteur."²⁰ The still popular designation of Touraine as "le jardin de France" is in this second book.²¹ In the second²² speech of Panurge in the "langage des antipodes," *Chinon* can be read quite as plainly as the above villages in the sixth speech. According to the map of the Chinonais,²³ Gravot and Chavigny are about three times as far from La Devinière as Chinon is. It may be

recalled also that the gesture made by the Englishman while arguing is designated by its name "en Chinonnoys."²⁴

The Chronology²⁵ of the life of Rabelais presents many dates of references to Rabelais, or to persons and events connected with him, that have rewarded recent research workers. A comparison, however, with the dates given in the biograph of Rabelais by Marty-Laveaux (-Huguet)²⁶ reveals but two important differences.²⁷ Marty-Laveaux gives the date of Rabelais' entering Saint-Maur-les-Fossés as 1540, whereas M. Clouzot finds that in 1536 Rabelais "figure parmi les chanoines prébendés de Saint-Maur." M. Clouzot also makes Rabelais resign his two curacies Jan. 9, 1553, instead of 1552.²⁸

M. Sainéan, in the philological notes, endeavors to call attention to all words coined by Rabelais, whether preserved in modern French or not. Such other words as are not to be found in the *Dictionnaire Général*, he attempts to replace "dans leur milieu et à leur époque."²⁹ It would be little short of miraculous if in so difficult a task all grounds for criticism had been avoided. The note³⁰ on *ou* (ou dialogue de Platon) ends: "La forme nasalisée *on* de la variante B est isolée et particulière à R." Does this mean that *on* is only found in B? But a little farther on, we read it in the text before us (E).³¹ Or, does it mean that *on*, in whatever text found, is peculiar to R? But Godefroy gives many examples of its use. *Le Psautier de Metz* alone abounds in them.³² There had even been a tendency in the literary language to confound the sounds *ou* and *on*. Christine de Pisan, for example,

¹⁶ Bk. II, ch. XIX.

¹⁷ Intro., pp. cxxviii-cxliii.

¹⁸ Vol. v, pp. iii-xxxvii.

¹⁹ The date 1539, which M-L names (p. xxvii), as the year R. took his "licence en médecine" is evidently a typographical error, as, later on (p. xxxi), 1537 is given.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. xxxv.

²¹ Intro., p. cxxvi.

²² Prol., l. 2, n. 6.

²³ Ch. V, l. 3.

²⁴ " . . . ne li pechour on conseil des justes, Ps., I, v. 6, etc.

¹⁶ Intro., p. lvii.

¹⁷ Intro., p. lvi.

¹⁸ Intro., p. xii.

¹⁹ Ch. IX.

²⁰ Intro., p. xii.

²¹ Ch. IX.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Intro., p. lxxv.

rimes moult: mont;³³ demonstre: loustre;³⁴ Longis: lousis.³⁵ The note³⁶ on *es* (=en les) seems still less satisfactory: "R. prend *es* dans ce passage (*semblable es Silenes*) et quelques autres (cf. l. 65 *pensast es allegories*) au sens de *aux*; il l'emploie généralement (cf. l. 5: *es bouticques*) au sens étymologique 'en les, dans les' (de même que Marot, Amyot et Montaigne)." But the use of *es* for *aux* is not a mere caprice of Rabelais. Godefroy gives examples of *es*, where to-day *aux* would be used, similar to every case in which R. so uses it. Oresme, the able translator of Charles V, writes: "Ils ressemblent *es* figures de notre temps."³⁷ As for *en* with *penser*, it had not only been occasionally used thus from early times,³⁸ but Marot, in his *Adieu aux Dames*, says: "Mais *en* ses amours pensera." The construction is still found in the seventeenth century.³⁹ It would seem more desirable to make such notes as these specific than to devote so much space to words in which the only difference from the modern form, is the presence of *ou* for *o* or vice-versa.⁴⁰

*Quel*⁴¹ is noted as a Latinism for *tel* in line ten of the Prologue, ". . . aultres telles pinctures . . . (*quel fut Silene . . .*)," and the words added: "pas d'autre emploi chez R." We shall be interested therefore in seeing how *quelles* is construed in the sentence: "C'est un poisson . . . ayant aesles cartilagineuses (*quelles sont es Souriz chaulves*), etc."⁴²

Of the words that call for remark we note only one that appears to have been overlooked: *dont*⁴³ introducing a sentence, in the sense of

C'est pourquoi;⁴⁴ or *a propos de quoi*.⁴⁵ The note on *dont*, interrogative,⁴⁶ seems incomprehensible: "*Dont* par suite de la prononciation fermée de l'*o* nasal se confondait alors avec *d'où*; il n'y avait pas de distinction rigoureuse entre *dont* pronom relatif et *dont* interrogatif." *Dont* from earliest times was used both as relative and interrogative.⁴⁷ The simple fact to be noted is that *d'où* had not yet supplanted *dont* as an interrogative. Maupas' Grammar (1607) still gives *dont* by the side of *d'où*.⁴⁸

The closing sentence of note 7, Chapter IX, appears to be misplaced. After a discussion of the word *trepelu*, in which an example of its use is cited from a "*sermon joyeux du XV^e s.*," we read: "*C'est sans doute à Grenoble que R. a entendu ce mot qu'on rencontre pour la première fois en français dans ce passage de Gargantua.*" In note 47, Chapter X, the word *analogie* is said to be a "néologisme introduit par R." Alain Chartier used the word a century before Rabelais: "Si dy que toutes noz atentes mondaines sont appellees Esperance par analogie."⁴⁹ Note 35 of Chapter XII reads: "*Le son oi s'est changé dès la fin du XV^e s. en ouè; de là les notations qu'on lit chez R.*" etc. But at the very beginning of the century Christine de Pisan, for example, writes *mirouer*;⁵⁰ *dourouer*; *refectouer*; *lavouer*; *parlouer*.⁵¹

The purely philological notes in this volume, form but a small part of the total number (1690). Many of them are digests of articles in the *RER.*, to which frequent reference is made. It is perhaps worth while to call attention to note 54 of Chapter VI. As the statement is made without further remark that "*R. n'est donc pas d'accord avec la mythologie traditionnelle en faisant sortir Castor et Polux du même oeuf*," it has possibly escaped notice that Rabelais follows in this Jean Lemaire

³³ *Dit de la Pastoure*, l. 53.

³⁴ *Debat*, l. 1479.

³⁵ *Œuvres poét.*, Vol. III, p. 24, l. 201.

³⁶ *Prol.*, l. 5, n. 8.

³⁷ Cited by Godefroy under the def. art. *le*.

³⁸ Cf. "Mais en la lei de nostre Seigneur la voluntet de lui, et en la sue lei purpenserat par jurn e par nuit." *Psalt. gal. vetus*, I, v. 2.

³⁹ Cf. Haase, *Syntaxe du XVII^e s.*, p. 359.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Prol.*, n. 33, 69, 122; Ch. I, n. 33; Ch. II, n. 3, 6, 22; Ch. VII, n. 4; Ch. VIII, n. 91; Ch. X, n. 7; Ch. XV, n. 3; Ch. XVII, n. 47.

⁴¹ N. 13.

⁴² Bk. IV, Ch. 3.

⁴³ Ch. VI, l. 37; Ch. VII, l. 7.

⁴⁴ Trans. of Huguet, *Pages choisis de R.*, p. 11.

⁴⁵ Trans. of Marty-Laveaux, Vol. v, p. 210.

⁴⁶ Ch. I, l. 2, n. 3.

⁴⁷ Cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, Vol. III, p. 39.

⁴⁸ P. 340.

⁴⁹ *Li Livre de l'Esperance*, éd. DuChesne, p. 328.

⁵⁰ *Œuvres poét.*, Vol. III, p. 4.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, *Dit de Poissy*, l. 324; see also Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Gr. der frz. Spr.*, Vol. I, § 83.

de Belges and Boccaccio: . . . *et luy fait pondre deux enfans*⁵² *à diverses fois: Cestadire luy fait faire quatre enfans à deux portees: dont de lune nasquirent Castor et Pollux freres jumeaux: et de l'autre Heleine et Clytemnestre, sœurs jumelles selon lopinion de Bocace.*⁵³

LUCY M. GAY.

University of Wisconsin.

Histoire illustrée de la littérature française, précis méthodique, par E. ABRY, C. AUDIC, P. CROUZET. Paris: Didier, 1912. xii + 664 pp.

MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet, teachers in French lycées, have produced an admirable manual of French literature. Their work has already begun to supersede a number of similar books at present in use in American high-schools and colleges, and fully deserves to do so. Dominated by the ideas of M. Lanson, it should occupy in the elementary teaching of French a position similar to that which the more profound and extensive work of the Professor of French literature at the Sorbonne holds in advanced and graduate work.

The authors describe their work as a "précis essentiellement réaliste." It has two distinctive characteristics, the substitution of historical for aesthetic criticism, and the systematic use of illustrations. MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet dispense with the subtle analyses of individual style and the elaborate comparisons of different writers which are common in literary histories, though of value chiefly to readers familiar with the authors discussed. They substitute information much more profitable to the students for whom the present hand-book is intended, abundant biographical details, brief but illuminating extracts and outlines, and helpful sketches of literary connections and historical background.

In analyzing literary traits and tendencies,

the authors attempt a purely objective treatment. In so doing they permit the skeleton of their work to obtrude itself upon the reader with somewhat excessive insistence. In discussing Alfred de Vigny, for example (pp. 514-5), they point out with all the emphasis of very black type that his character had *three* principal qualities: "1. La tristesse;" "2. L'orgueil;" "3. La pitié." Similarly, his literary theories are summarized under "1. L'impersonnalité," and "2. Le symbole." Under each of these headings extracts are given in illustration of the statements made. At first sight this system appears mechanical and dogmatic, but more careful examination shows that the context softens the harshness of the outline, and that the extracts lend it life and meaning. Upon the whole, though the attempt to abstain from aesthetic criticism has been carried out with some exaggeration, the step taken in this direction is distinctly to be commended.

Like a number of other text-books issued by the same publisher, the book is remarkable for the large number (324) and the excellence of its illustrations. M. Crouzet, who was responsible for this part of the book, gives evidence of taste and judgment. Though the small size of the reproductions makes them in some cases difficult to appreciate—the legends of M. Crouzet frequently call attention to details that are scarcely visible—yet the freshness, variety, and helpfulness of the pictures are worthy of all praise. A student who sees a page reproduced from Montaigne's printed copy of his *Essais*, with numerous manuscript corrections (p. 108), or from Racine's Greek text of Aeschylus, with careful annotations in Racine's own hand (p. 244), gains a definite and useful appreciation of the way in which the masterpieces of French literature developed. *Préciosité* and the funeral orations of Bossuet are brought measurably nearer to one who sees the *Carte du Tendre* (p. 136) and an excellent picture of the funeral of Henriette d'Angleterre (p. 260).

The taste of the writers of the history, to judge from their inclusions and exclusions as well as their characterizations, is in general very good. As is to be expected in a school book, certain sides of French literature are de-

⁵² The ms. of Geneva reads *eufz*; cf. *Œuvres de J. L. de B.*, p. p. J. Stecher, 1882, Vol. 2, p. 22.

⁵³ *Illustrations de la Gaule*, Bk. II, Ch. ii.

cidedly ignored; the extracts from Rabelais are all edifying, and one is amazed at the success of the authors in ferreting out so many unobjectionable *fabliaux* to present as specimens of the *genre*. A certain sympathy with the masses appears in the respectful treatment accorded the novels of Dumas *père* and in the mild strictures passed upon Coppée.

As in many histories of French literature, the weakest part of the book is that dealing with the middle ages. Here the chief drawback consists in embracing the whole period anterior to 1500 in one section, divided only according to literary species (epic, history, satire, etc.), so that no distinction is made in the mind of the student between the earlier and the later mediaeval period.

There are naturally many single points upon which one is minded to differ from MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet. It is surprising to hear nothing of *La belle dame sans merci* in connection with Alain Chartier. Du Bartas comes off rather ill, as usual; he is represented by a ridiculous passage, and nothing is said of Milton's indebtedness to him, though Goethe and Tasso are spoken of as admirers. No mention is made of Massillon's avoidance of dogma and consequent popularity with the eighteenth century *philosophes*. Great enthusiasm is displayed for the works of Victor Hugo, and mediaevalists may be surprised to hear the *Légende des Siècles* described as "notre plus grand poème épique" (p. 508). Sainte-Beuve the poet is spoken of as a precursor of Coppée alone (p. 530); mention of his influence upon Baudelaire also would have been appropriate. It seems strange to find a funeral discourse by Pasteur, inspired by deep feeling, cited (p. 590) as an example of the "style scientifique." Admirers of Daudet will hardly be satisfied with a treatment of his works which gives a place of honor to the uneven *Petit chose*, the melodramatic *Fromont jeune et Risler aîné*, and the insignificant *Sapho*, barely mentions *Jack* and *Le Nabab*, and says nothing whatever of *Numa Roumestan* and the short stories. The average American reader will probably criticize an apportionment of space which gives Huysmans one line (p. 627) and Fromentin a

whole page (pp. 621-22). English-speaking people would doubtless wish to see such writers as Joubert, Amiel, and Cherbuliez included among the authors discussed.

The relations of language and literature receive adequate and accurate treatment. *Vulpeculum* as the etymon of *goupil* (p. 30, n. 1) is probably a misprint. By an unfortunate oversight, all the words introduced into the language by the Pléiade, including such common words as *patrie* (? See Godefroy, *Comp.*, s. v.), *pudeur*, *police*, are described as adopted "sans discrétion ni méthode" from different languages. They are given (p. 115) under the heading "Les excès de la Pléiade" !

In discussing points relating to the part played by Frenchmen in the advancement of knowledge, the authors are occasionally a little chauvinistic. Guizot's *Histoire de la révolution d'Angleterre* is scarcely regarded as an authority in England nowadays (p. 576). Michelet is hardly the "inventor of true historical method" (p. 583). Fermat did not discover the differential calculus (p. 112); he "almost discovered" it (*Enc. Brit.*, 11th ed., xiv, 539, b). D'Alembert is not generally regarded as the first mathematician of his day (p. 308). Others shared with Buffon the honor of "creating" geology and paleontology (p. 310).

In regard to matters of fact a high standard of accuracy has been attained. The following points call for rectification; many of them are mere misprints. The *serventois* is hardly a simple "chanson badine" (p. 53). Guillaume de Machaut has found an editor in the person of Prof. Hoepffner (p. 54). Jean Lemaire de Belges is incorrectly called *des Belges* (pp. 60, 64); elsewhere (p. 81) the correct form occurs. Scaliger did not formulate the rule of the three unities in 1561 (p. 162); Castelvetro, the true author of the rule, so far as our knowledge at present goes, did not advance it until 1570. A letter of Madame de Maintenon (p. 189) is dated 1896 instead of 1686. M. Brunschvicg's name is spelt with a *w* on pp. 200, n. 1, and 206 (correctly on p. 204). Fénelon's name is de Salagnac and not Salignac (p. 271). Huet was bishop of Avranches and not

of Soissons (p. 302). P. 313 read Chesterfield for Chersterfield. Vauvenargues' name was Luc de Clapiers and not de Clapier (p. 326). P. 330 for Grandisson read Grandison. Of the four possible dates for the publication of the *Neveu de Rameau*,¹ 1891 is the only one mentioned (p. 374); one of the earlier dates would be preferable. It is usual but entirely inaccurate to speak of Anatole France as an "ancien chartiste" (p. 627).

Perhaps the most serious objection to the book from a pedagogical standpoint is its length; it is considerably more extensive (664 pages) than most of the books intended for similar purposes. This difficulty can easily be surmounted by judicious omissions. Most of the increased bulk, moreover, is due to the illustrations and the extracts, which put but little burden upon the student. It may also be noted in this connection that the excellent arrangement of the book renders the consecutive reading of it much easier than in the case of many similar works. Upon the whole, the new history merits the heartiest commendation. Teachers who may not desire to use it as a text-book would do well to procure it for the sake of the illustrations as well as for personal use.

D. S. BLONDHEIM.

University of Illinois.

Vom Ursprung der provenzalischen Schriftsprache von HEINRICH MORF (Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe, 1912, XLV, pp. 1014-1035).

Cette étude, dit M. Morf (p. 1035), pourrait s'intituler¹ "histoire d'un contre-sens." Le contre-sens est celui des provençalistes qui, sur

¹ Goethe's German translation, 1805; French re-translation of Goethe, 1821; first authentic French edition, 1823; publication of the text of an autograph manuscript, 1891.

² Ce titre permettrait aussi de croire que M. Morf traite, à l'occasion du provençal littéraire, le problème si complexe et si important de la formation des "langues communes": il n'en est rien.

la foi des *Razos de trobar* du Catalan Raimon Vidal (et sur la foi des *Leys d'Amors*), ont cru que le dialecte du Limousin est la source de la langue littéraire dont usent les troubadours. Or, après avoir rappelé l'opinion plus ou moins explicitement formulée d'une dizaine de savants modernes, M. Morf montre:

1. que le témoignage des *Leys d'amors*² ne vaut pas, puisqu'il est directement inspiré des *Razos*;

2. que, chez Raimon Vidal, "limousin" signifie non pas "dialecte du Limousin," mais "provençal," c'est-à-dire langue de tout le Midi de la France.

M. Morf suppose, en outre, que Raimon Vidal a choisi "limousin" en raison de la célébrité des troubadours limousins qui florissaient de son temps (en particulier Giraut de Bornelh).

Le texte des *Razos* ne permet point de douter que M. Morf ait raison: "Neguna parladura non es naturala ni drecha del nostre lengage mais acellà de Franza e de Lemozi, o³ de Proenza o d'Alvergna o de Caersin; per qe ieu vos dic que, quant ieu parlarai de Lemosy, que totas estas terras entendas et totas lor vezinas et totas cellas que son entre ellas."—Mais il est bien invraisemblable qu'un texte aussi clair ait pu si longtemps tromper tant de gens.⁴ M. Morf confond, ce me semble, deux choses bien distinctes: la question de l'origine limousine de la langue des troubadours et le sens de "limousin" chez Raimon Vidal. Or, même si Raimon Vidal et les *Leys d'Amors* n'existaient pas, le "provençal" des troubadours pourrait encore être du "limousin" très pur: c'est pourquoi la plupart des savants cités par M. Morf (Gaston

² Et ceux de Terramagnino et de Jaufre de Foixá qui proviennent également de Raimon Vidal.

³ Texte d'Appel, *Provençalische Chrestomathie*, pp. 195-196. M. Morf écrit partout *e* (MS. B) au lieu de *o* (MSS. CHL); il me semble que le contexte ne justifie *e* que pour *de Franza e de Lemozi*, puisque dans la suite Raimon Vidal ne distingue qu'entre la *parladura francesca* et *cella de Lemosin*, V., pour la légitimité de *Proenza* dans ce passage, *Annales du Midi*, I, p. 10, n.

⁴ M. Morf cite lui-même, p. 1022, n. 1. une phrase où Diez indique le contre-sens possible.

Paris, Anglade, Meyer-Lübke, Counson)—qui ne font point mention des *Razos*—n'auront tort qu'autant qu'il sera démontré que la langue des premiers troubadours n'est pas du "limousin." Et M. Morf n'apporte aucune démonstration de ce genre.⁵

Il reste qu'il a mis en pleine lumière l'interprétation vraie de *Lemosy* chez Raimon Vidal et qu'il a suggéré la raison qui a fait adopter à Raimon Vidal le nom de cette province pour désigner la langue provençale; on s'étonnera pourtant que M. Morf ait cru devoir le faire avec tant d'ampleur après que M. Paul Meyer a écrit dans son article classique de *l'Encyclopædia Britannica*:⁶ "In the 13th century a poet born in Catalonia . . . , Raimon Vidal of Besalù, introduced the name of *Limousin* language, probably on account of the great reputation of some *Limousin* troubadours; but he took care to define the expression, which he extended beyond its original meaning, by saying that in speaking of *Limousin* he must be understood to include *Saintonge, Quercy, Auvergne, etc.* This expression found favor in

⁵ Il n'entreprend même pas cette démonstration et se borne à dire (p. 1030 et n. 4) que, pour savoir dans quelle région s'est formée la langue des troubadours, nous aurions besoin d'une grammaire historique du limousin et, plus généralement, des dialectes provençaux. Sans doute.—M. Morf aurait pu citer encore M. Jean Beck, *La musique des troubadours*, Paris (1910), pp. 22-23 ["les premiers troubadours—et aussi les meilleurs—sont originaires des régions limitrophes du Limousin et . . . la langue littéraire qu'ils écrivent tous, sans distinction d'origine, est appelée par les contemporains (!) le langage limousin (*lingua lemosina*)"], et rappeler que M. Beck a la "certitude" que "les plus anciennes compositions musicales des troubadours sont d'inspiration religieuse" et que "l'enseignement des abbayes limonsines (S. Martial, S. Léonard et autres) a exercé une influence prédominante sur la musique profane" (l. l.). Le problème linguistique se double d'un problème musicologique, si tant est que M. Beck n'ait pas résolu celui-ci.

⁶ 11e édition, 1911, t. xxii, p. 491 (*id.*, 9e éd., 1885, t. xix, p. 868).—Cf. un autre article de M. Paul Meyer, *La langue romane du Midi de la France et ses différents noms* (*Annales du Midi*, I, pp. 1 sqq., notamment p. 7—sur Jaufre de Foixá—, et pp. 9-10—sur Raimon Vidal).

Spain . . . and in the same country *lingua lemosina* long designated at once the Provençal and the old literary Catalan."

A. TERRACHER.

The Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE BITER BIT

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—To its definition of *bit* as the mouth-piece of a bridle, the *NED.* appends the following note:

"It is not clear whether the word in this sense signifies that which the horse bites, or that which bites or grips the horse's mouth."

Light may be thrown on this question by another use of *bit* that seems thus far to have escaped the attention of lexicographers, namely, to denote the mouth-piece of a tobacco-pipe. When the word is used in this sense (common among both pipe-makers and pipe-users), the reference is doubtless to the biting man, not to the *beizender Toback*. There is a chance, to be sure, that this use has been taken over directly from the other, but that seems to me rather unlikely.

FRED NEWTON SCOTT.

University of Michigan.

A QUOTATION FROM MÖRIKE

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—In Heyse's *Anfang und Ende* (1857) the hero, Valentin, reads while waiting for the heroine, Eugenie, Mörike's poems. Heyse writes: "Er . . . vertieft sich . . . in die 'Mondscheingärten einer einst heiligen Liebe.'" Professor McLouth says (Holt, 1910, notes p. 65): "No such title occurs in Mörike's published works. It is probably a humorous invention of Heyse's as a good-natured joke on Mörike's romantic tendencies." But Heyse is too much of an artist to joke with a poet whom he intensely admires. The poem referred

to by Heyse is found in *Maler Nolten* (1832), p. 214 of the 2d volume of the 5th edition (Götschen, 1897). It is the third of the five "Peregrina" poems and begins:

"Ein Irrsal kam in die Mondscheingärten
Einer einst heiligen Liebe."

Heyse's reference to the poem is happy. This is namely one of the lyrics Mörike wrote about that mystic beauty who called herself Maria Clara Meyer and who caused Mörike some embarrassment. (Cf. *Eduard Mörikes Leben und Werke*, by Karl Fischer, 1901, pp. 51 ff.) *Maler Nolten* was revised by Mörike and there is a version of this poem dated July 6, 1824, beginning:

"Ein Irrsal kam in die Zaubergärten
Einer fast heiligen Liebe."

ALLEN WILSON PORTERFIELD.

Barnard College.

BRIEF MENTION

The Science of Etymology, by the Rev. W. W. Skeat (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912). Professor Skeat's last book comes to us when all students of English are lamenting his death. There is nothing in the book that betokens a waning of power or of enthusiasm; nothing of an abatement of that persistent solicitude with which, for so many years, he has been instructing the public in the historic and comparative methods of regarding the facts of the language. Professor Skeat has had a large share in advancing linguistic science; and for the historic study of English he has rendered inestimable service by a surprising amount of expert work in the editing and especially in the annotating of early texts. He has stood in the foremost rank with those who have put English lexicography on the 'basis of historic facts and principles.' His knowledge of the language in all its periods has been masterful, his industry unflinching, and the exploring ingenuity of his mind has been balanced by a sanity of judgment that has won a world-wide confidence in his pronouncements. On the side of grammar

and comparative linguistics he has been an eager and progressive pupil of phonetics, morphology, and other divisions of the science to which his own contributions were of a more dependent character. To the end he has maintained characteristic vigor and eagerness in keeping sympathetically abreast with all investigation, and in promptly assimilating and genially and generously promulgating the most available results for the profit of a wider public. However varied the activities of this devoted scholar, his well-earned renown is centered in what he has achieved as etymologist. His name will be kept in enduring association with the subject of English etymology, which in his day and largely under his shared leadership was based on principles of accuracy. In this last treatise, which is "to draw attention to some of the principles that should guide the student of etymology in general, and of English etymology particularly," Professor Skeat has aimed to mediate, in his characteristic and attractive manner, between the technical investigator and the general reader, whom he would urge science-ward by showing him "how to make use of an English etymological dictionary" (p. 35). Canons of etymology are drawn up and illustrated; erroneous methods of derivation are exposed; rules and principles of historic changes in 'sounds' and 'forms' are made clear to the mind of average training; and in a succession of chapters, constituting the larger portion of the book, the English cognates traceable in the diverse languages of the 'family' are brought together in instructive lists. The book is well indexed (pp. 213-242) and should serve its purpose admirably.

Homer's Odyssey; a line-for-line translation in the metre of the original, by H. B. Cotterill. With twenty-four illustrations by Patten Wilson (Boston, Dana Estes & Co., 1912. \$5.50). This is a luxurious quarto. Its material make-up suggests the extravagance of a holiday season; but its artistic typography and the excellent art of its illustrations impose a limit on the suggestion. It is a book to go through the whole year with one, and it has an interest for the student of English meters that will be permanent. The translator, in a brief preface, discusses his choice of metric form. He recalls Matthew Arnold's controversy with Mr. Spedding, and adopts the conclusion that the English accentual hexameter, "in its effect upon

us moderns," is the closest imitation of the 'ancient' meter. Mr. Cotterill gratifies the reader by his clear statement of what he knows and feels to be true of the essentials of English versification, and in his attempt to write hexameters that will 'read themselves' he has, without doubt, been very successful. Many of his lines are, of course, more or less deficient in self-help, but these will be carried along without too much effort. Surely a new pleasure is in store for him who will now re-read his *Odyssey* according to the rhythm represented at its best by such lines as (selected for illustration by Mr. Cotterill himself): "Flashing she fell to the earth from the glittering heights of Olympus" (i, 102); and "Thine was the counsel that captured the wide-wayed city of Priam" (xxii, 230). Mr. Cotterill, in his preface, gives special attention to the meter of the *Voyage of Maeldune*, but misleads himself by a 'technical' analysis of what is clearly an anapestic Alexandrine, with a free cesura. It is therefore not so closely related to his dactylic hexameter.

The Modern Reader's Chaucer. The Complete Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, now first put into Modern English. By John S. P. Tatlock and Percy Mackay. Illustrations by Warwick Goble (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1912. \$5). Of this sumptuous quarto, with its beautiful pictures in color, one must hesitate before saying that it is chiefly a holiday book, although that may be one's first impression of it. Happily, there is now a general disposition to believe that too much can't be done for the popularization of Chaucer. That's a great gain. And at the hands of two such eminent Chaucerians as the present translators, both poet and public cannot fail to be rightly considered; there can be no doubt of that. One may thus find justification for a hearty approval of this project. At all events, since this prose-rendering (there are minor parts in verse) is a continuation and completion of the version begun by Mr. Mackay in his volume of 1904, it may be argued that the intervening years have made clear to the translators the extent of the book's usefulness. Granting then that it may be profitable to have a derailment of Chaucer's verse and a modernization of his language, the right remains to insist that this be done in the very best manner. That the translators have left a margin for revision cannot be denied. The conspicuous and familiar beginning of the book at once arrests

attention disappointingly: "and bathed every vine in moisture;" for this does 'misrepresent' (p. vii) the poet as, in the applicable words of Meredith,

"He sings of sap, the quickened veins;
The wedding song of sun and rains."

To a large extent the process of modernizing Chaucer's language is as easy as mere transcription, but the historic changes in the meaning of words and in the fashion of expressions make ample amends for this ease by peculiar and subtle difficulties. One of the temptations to which the modernizer is exposed is that of an incomplete recasting of idiom, which may give an altogether un-English result. The following sentence illustrates both the ease of transference and the temptation: "But what availeth so long a sermon about, and about, the chances of love?" (*Compl. of Mars*, 209-10). It is also possible to miss the plain prose sense when Chaucer becomes involved in construction. "When I was first created," etc. (*id.* 164 f.) is glaringly impossible. There is in this volume no uniform level of workmanship. A fine creative touch describes the Sumner "with slits for eyes" (*with eyen narwe*), and an unwarranted interference compels the host to swear by "beer or wine" (*As ever mote I drinke wyn or ale*, *Prol.* 832). But such trifles need not be multiplied. The book will interest many readers, and its value may far exceed one's initial expectation.

Pellissier's *XVIIe siècle par les textes* (Paris, Delagrave, 1908; see *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. xxiv, p. 183) and his *XVIIIe siècle* (1911) are now completed by a similar volume for the nineteenth century (1912) which maintains the high standard set by the earlier collections, though for the nineteenth century, with its great mass of literature, the problem of giving sufficiently long and sufficiently representative selections in a book of 475 pages is almost too hard to solve. In spite of this, the volume will serve as a valuable aid to all instructors who do not prefer to make their own choice of characteristic passages for classroom use. Particularly well chosen are Pellissier's selections from Joseph de Maistre (*Le bourreau*), from Chateaubriand and Madame de Staël, from Villemain and Thiers (*Rôle de l'intelligence*),—if only they were longer. The volume is accompanied by relevant and interesting illustrations.

A. S.